

THE
ANDOVER REVIEW

VOLUME XVI.—PUBLISHED MONTHLY.—NUMBER XCV.

NOVEMBER, 1891

CONTENTS

	PAGE
1. THE PREACHING OF THE GOSPEL. <i>Christian Van Der Veen, D. D.</i>	433
2. SHOP-GIRLS AND THEIR WAGES. <i>Professor J. H. Hyslop</i>	455
3. THE EDUCATION OF THE INDIANS. <i>W. Barrows, D. D.</i>	479
4. RECENT PROGRESS IN BALLOT REFORM. <i>Mr. Frederic G. Mather</i>	492
5. CONSERVATIVE APOLOGETICS. <i>Professor E. H. Johnson</i>	502
6. EDITORIAL.	
THE NEW YORK PRESBYTERY AND PROFESSOR BRIGGS.	511
THE LIMITS OF LIBERTY: A BISHOP'S CHARGE TO HIS CLERGY	515
PRESIDENT PATTON'S RECOVERED ADDRESS ON FUTURE PROBATION—WITH BRIEF ANNOTATIONS	520
7. THEOLOGICAL AND RELIGIOUS INTELLIGENCE.	
REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE OF PROSECUTION IN THE CASE OF DR. BRIGGS, WITH CHARGES AND SPECIFICATIONS	529
8. BOOKS RECEIVED	543

BOSTON
HOUGHTON, MIFFLIN AND COMPANY

NEW YORK: 11 EAST SEVENTEENTH STREET

The Riverside Press, Cambridge

LONDON: WARD, LOCK & CO., WARWICK HOUSE, SALISBURY SQUARE

Entered at the Post Office at Boston as second-class matter

TERMS—SINGLE NUMBERS, 35 CENTS

YEARLY SUBSCRIPTION, \$4.00

THE
GENIAL
AUTO-
CRAT.

Long Life
and
Happiness!



COMPLETE POETICAL AND PROSE WORKS OF
OLIVER WENDELL HOLMES.

NEW RIVERSIDE EDITION

in the same style as the *Riverside* Longfellow. With Portraits, Notes by Dr. Holmes, etc. Vols. 1-10, Prose Works. Vols. 11-13, Poetical Works. In 13 volumes, crown 8vo, each volume, \$1.50; the set, \$19.50; half calf, \$35.75; half calf, gilt top, \$39.00; half levant, \$52.00.

1. *The Autocrat of the Breakfast-Table.* 2. *The Professor at the Breakfast-Table.* 3. *The Poet at the Breakfast-Table.* 4. *Over the Teacups.* 5. *Elsie Venner.* 6. *The Guardian Angel.* 7. *A Mortal Antipathy.* 8. *Pages from an Old Volume of Life.* 9. *Medical Essays.* 10. *Our Hundred Days in Europe.* 11, 12, 13. *Poems.*

PROSE WORKS: RIVERSIDE EDITION:

10 vols. crown 8vo, gilt top, \$15.00; half calf, \$27.50; half calf, gilt top, \$30.00; half levant, \$40.00.

POEMS: RIVERSIDE EDITION.

3 vols. crown 8vo, gilt top, \$4.50; half calf, \$8.25; half calf, gilt top, \$9.00; half levant, \$12.00.

FOR SALE BY ALL BOOKSELLERS. SENT BY MAIL, POST-PAID, ON RECEIPT OF PRICE BY THE PUBLISHERS, HOUGHTON, MIFFLIN AND CO., 4 PARK STREET, BOSTON; 11 EAST 17th STREET, NEW YORK.

n
e
s,
f,
+
-
6.
s
o.

o;

alf

ON
ND
RK.

THE
ANDOVER REVIEW:

A RELIGIOUS AND THEOLOGICAL MONTHLY.

VOL. XVI.—NOVEMBER, 1891.—No. XCV.

THE PREACHING OF THE GOSPEL.

WHAT is the ministry? What is its prime purpose? What is its essential message? It may be late in the day to ask such questions, but it can be shown that they are not superfluous. As one proof, we submit the mere fact that there is a constant impulse in the church to ask them. There is also, one would almost say, a growing diversity of answers. In this article these questions are asked for a specific reason. The proper answer to the last question, as comprehending the other two, is constantly in danger. I wish to set forth and defend the gospel.

For, of course, the Scriptural answer to the question is, the gospel. The great commission defines the ministry, its purpose, its message. "Go ye into all the world and preach the *gospel* to every creature." This word "gospel" has a definite meaning, which never varies in the Book. It is "the gospel of peace, glad tidings of good things" (Rom. x. 15); "the gospel of your salvation" (Eph. i. 13); "the gospel of the grace of God" (Acts xx. 24). The great apostle sets forth the whole relation thus: "God gave unto us the *ministry of reconciliation*, to wit, that God was in Christ reconciling the world unto himself, not reckoning unto them their trespasses, and having put in us the *word of reconciliation*. On behalf of Christ we are therefore *ambassadors*, as though God were *entreating* through us: we *beseech* on behalf of Christ, *be ye reconciled to God*" (2 Cor. v. 19, 20). Let us try to enter into this "gospel of God" and "of Christ."

Of late years, no questions have excited a more lively interest than those involved in the coming of Christ as "the Saviour of the world" (1 John iv. 14). The facts of man's need of a Saviour,

of Christ's personality as the true and only Saviour, and of salvation by grace and not by works, have been settled in former generations, when the church specifically fought the battle on behalf of these truths. Calvin, the great theologian of the Reformation, secured a new and intelligent acceptance of the two invaluable truths emphasized by Paul and later by Augustine, and well nigh universally denied at the time of the Reformation. First, that Jesus Christ, in his redeeming work as the Saviour of men, did a real and effective work; not merely removing obstacles in the way of man's salvation, or rendering it possible or consistent for God to allow or to aid in the saving of sinners, but "obtaining eternal redemption," "bringing salvation," a genuine fact to be submitted to men's faith, that is, to the appropriating faculty by which man gets hold of invisible things. These are veritable "things of God, graciously given to us of God" (1 Cor. ii. 12). Secondly, that the bestowal of this actual salvation is not according to desert, but according to grace, it being a *bona fide* offer of the divine love to sinners equally lost and equally incapable of self-saving. This was a permanent service. In many places it needs to be emphasized to-day. God did not provide a salvation for those whom He foresaw would be fittest for and most deserving of salvation according to any human estimate, but for the undeserving, the lost. His grace abounds to the chief of sinners.

As compared with the Arminian view, the Calvinistic conception of the individual as the object of God's grace is thoroughly Scriptural. But the old Calvinism was deficient by a too narrow conception of election. Its idea of the world for which Christ died, and to which the gospel was applicable, was too contracted. This is not strange, if we consider the age and the stage of that civilization which expresses the modifying influence of the gospel upon the larger relations of humanity. The full meaning of the Fatherhood of God was not apprehended, and the brotherhood of men was an unknown idea. It was an age in which the only conception of the world possible to each nation was: We and our foes; or, We and the barbarians. In such a division of mankind, God's good things are for us, with wrath for our enemies, and unconcern for the barbarians. We have not yet fully outgrown such distinctions. The church necessarily partook of the narrowness of the nations, and in its view salvation was as partial a grant as was liberty, or learning, or wealth, or supremacy, in the view of the peoples. This intrinsically selfish conception or estimate of God's dealings was defended by, and professedly based

upon, distorted views of the Divine Sovereignty. For this no better guide was known than an inscrutable purpose, practically indistinguishable from arbitrariness, instead of the plainly revealed divine love to which all things in God are instruments and ministries. It was indeed a mighty step in advance when men were taught that they owed what they had to God in a sovereign dispensing, rather than to themselves in a meagre self-righteousness. For it humbled men, and brought them into real contact with God. But it did not do full justice to God as He is, nor to his government of the world as administered by the Son, "whom He hath appointed heir of all things." It never rose to Paul's conception of the divine love and its large freedom, as set forth in Romans xi., and in the Epistles to the Ephesians and the Colossians.

To our age belongs the settlement of the question of the applicability of a divine salvation by grace to the world. Of that world we of to-day have a larger and more sympathetic conception than any generation before us. Yet our conception of it is certainly not large enough. Of the relation of Jesus Christ to that world we are trying to get fuller knowledge. We have not yet come to have perfectly clear perceptions of its wide range, but we shall have at some time. The Holy Spirit is leading the church in its investigation of this question. It is the pivot of the most active religious thinking; it is the essential point in the religious controversies of the day; it is the guide in the exegetical work of the time; it is the purpose of the unprecedented passion of our generation to become better acquainted with the person Jesus Christ, who lived and died in the world as the Son of man and Son of God; it is the inspiration in the best, noblest, and most successful work of the church, — its carrying the light of God's love into all the dark places of the earth. Timid souls may deprecate the stir which marks this new search after truth, but souls who believe in God can only await the future with a glad confidence; for the only outcome must be, that the world shall have a better understanding of the things freely given to it of God in Him whom God sent to be its Saviour.

From more than one side, indeed, this view is still denied, disputed, discouraged. The unbelief of our day knows nothing, can know nothing, of such a drawing near of God to men as can furnish the only ground for such a mission as the word "gospel" indicates. A prevalent conception of the church discountenances the earnestness, the largeness, the pathos which are in Paul's words

the assurance of an immeasurable hope for men as men. The timidity inseparable from a one-sided theological system restrains the utterance of an invitation which shall do justice at once to the infinite love of an infinite God, and to the illimitable needs of a lost world.

The time has come when the church of Christ should give more serious consideration to that question of utmost moment to itself, Why has the preached gospel of the grace of God as yet so little power among lost men? To find the answer still, as has been so steadily done, in the general, original disinclination of men to believe it, does not suffice. The gospel counts upon this estrangement, and proposes to overcome it in every instance by its power as a promise. It is a most miserable subterfuge when a preacher can satisfy himself with preaching a gospel like this to sinners for "a witness against them." To preach it in a wholesale way, in a professed ignorance of God's design with it in any particular instance, is unworthy an intelligent preacher. The ignorance may be real, both on the part of the preacher and hearer, but it is not to their credit. It may also be true that this ignorance does not affect the responsibility of the hearer in his treatment of God's message. But that the Lord God should take advantage of that ignorance, and because of it should push claims which presuppose understanding, is an astounding view of the ethics which the Eternal practices. Nothing can more thoroughly unfit a gospel preacher for his real business than the persuasion that God sends him to do things for show, or for the mere increase of condemnation, or to furnish the Judge of all the earth with an excuse for seeming to do in right sequence what was decided upon beforehand. God has determined nothing that needs to be justified by anything less than absolute right, such right as moral creatures can consent to, a righteousness which is of the essence of love. "God is light, and in Him is no darkness at all." It is a pertinent question to be put to the church, whether the world rejects the gospel as a salvation, not merely applicable to, but intended for, the world. And it is a most important question for every preacher, who must give account of his ministry as a ministry of reconciliation, whether his hearers receive the gospel from him as a personal and in every way genuine offer of eternal life.

It is quite possible for ministers to be simply transmitters, in a decorous and edifying manner, of a system of logical ideas, which shall maintain the historical existence of the church as a reformed or super-reformed church. Who would in such cases

deny to men zealous in such occupation the name of clergymen, or cast doubt on the honesty of intention or the dignity of their efforts? But such teachers have no exclusive right, possibly they have no right at all, to the designation, ambassadors for Christ. It is quite possible to learn theology, even orthodox theology, without coming in contact with the Christ. It is also possible to teach theology without administering reconciliation. History is full of proof. May it not be feared that the world is so largely indifferent to the preached gospel because, among other things, the church still makes the difference between theology and the gospel so prominent?

The necessity of a satisfactory self-defense upon this point increases daily for ministers of the gospel. It sometimes looks as though the choice would ere long be between the justification of our mission to the world, and a being confined to a certain class of men, — such as are still driven by a selfish fear to connect their eternal hope with a man of clerical dignity, and to quiet their inward fear by submissively listening to phrases which gratify their religious feeling.

There are those who say that this choice has already come, and that many ministers have already adopted the latter alternative; hence, that in this will be found the reason why a growing proportion of what, in the sphere of the world, are the most serious, active, and wide-awake men, concern themselves so little with spiritual things as presented by the church. May their indifference not be attributed in part to the lack of earnestness on the part of the ministry in presenting an efficient salvation? Much of the gospel preached is on a low spiritual plane. Thinking men do not feel that that kind of gospel meets in them a real want.

But I do not design now formally to enter upon this problem, Why has the ordinary preaching so little effect upon the more developed intellect? It is simply submitted as a living question to the church and ministry of to-day. For while it is true that the judgment of the world in this matter is not a decisive criterion, yet the influence of the gospel, as preached, upon the world, is a criterion of the reality and value of our work as a Christian church. The Lord Jesus said: "I came not to judge the world, but to save the world." Whatever can in any degree justify the world in withdrawing from the church condemns the church. Therefore the church must always consult its past record in relation to the Word and to the world. A better understanding of that

past must serve to perfect the witness of the church of the present by simplifying its message. Improvement in the message is no uncharitable condemnation of the past. Better methods are no denial of the important work of the church throughout the ages. The changes in the past are so many that it is difficult to say now to which form of the presentation of the truth the palm must be awarded as practical influences in the salvation of the world. Each system contends for the meed of praise. The adherents of one are inclined to depreciate the effort of another. But the award becomes more and more difficult. Church history is largely a record of mutual rejections within the Christian church because of differences of opinion, and at the same time the recital of the practical, beneficent influence of these opposing views upon the moral development of men. The conclusion of history is, that where the word of God is free and accessible, and thus makes possible a life-communion with the Christ as a living Person, it is no hard task to find a working theory of religion. The practical result does not always justify our logic. Systems which were condemned as heresies by councils and synods have proved full of saving influences, by the truth still in them, when wielded by men who proceeded from a genuine love to God and men. No church was ever lost because of deficient or distorted views of theological truth, nor has any church been saved by the orthodoxy of an inherited system. No quickened church has ever allowed itself to be persuaded that the best part of its heritage was the intellectual legacy of previous generations. Nor has any earnest church ever been able to suppress the feeling of a holy call to new voyages of discovery. Nor will the true church ever be able to rest until it knows not only what is, but also what is not, in the wide revelation of God. Until it knows all, its ear will be reverently open to the thoughts of men as well as to the thoughts of God. And in the application of the will of God — ever yet limited by an incomplete understanding of that will — the church will consult no less the needs of the world as presented by itself, and the witness of the universal conscience, than the revelation contained in the Book. And the church will always find that at last only faith, that is, knowledge of God in Christ, overcomes the world.

In addition, a few questions, which are still living questions, may well be pondered by the ministry.

Does, even in our time of active thinking and freer speech, theology really keep pace with the development of the other sciences?

Are the ruling opinions, as they find utterance in the ordinary preaching, concerning God and man and their mutual relations sufficiently complete, and in full accord with the revelation in Scripture and in nature?

Does the ministry exercise enough of the calmness which befits those who have been made free by the truth, in listening to and trying to understand sound reason, as no despicable test of our conceptions of truths, admittedly held upon the authority of tradition, more or less sanctified by merely human associations?

Is the form of its labors large enough, if the gospel as a ministry of reconciliation affects the entire man and concerns the world as world?

Are the motives urged in recommending the gospel sufficiently exalted and wholly worthy both of God and man?

In brief, have ministers of Christ enough of faith in Christ to appeal simply to his right as the Christ among men, and to rest in the assurance of Christ's power as a sure, drawing force?

For there the Scriptures place the right, the reality, the seriousness, the promise of this work of the gospel ministry. "We are ambassadors for Christ."

The idea of an official representative which underlies this word is also in all the words used to designate the office of the preacher. Apostle, messenger, elder, overseer, minister, herald, are but different forms of this relation. The dispensation of grace is mediately administered. The term "ambassador" is connected with a system. "All things are of God, who reconciled us to himself through Christ. . . . God was in Christ reconciling the world unto himself, not reckoning unto them their trespasses: *therefore* we are *ambassadors* for Christ." The gospel scheme of reconciliation proceeds from God, and is carried out by Jesus Christ his Son. He is its prime Agent, its Prophet, Priest, and King. The work of Christ as Redeemer is done on the behalf of God. In it all He came to do the Father's will. Through the whole dispensation of reconciliation, He is the representative of the Father. God *sent* his Son to men. Hence He is called in Hebrews "the Apostle, Messenger, and Highpriest of our confession." By the word *sending* He interprets the full meaning of his life among us. To the Jews who sought to kill Him, He said, "I came not of myself, the Father sent me" (John viii. 42). That word is the sufficient warrant of his truth: "He whom God hath sent speaketh the words of God" (John iii. 34). That word explains his person: "The Father that sent me is with me, He hath not

left me alone" (John viii. 29). It justifies the closest identification of himself with God: "Say ye of Him whom the Father sanctified and sent into the world, Thou blasphemest; because I said, I am the Son of God?" (John x. 36). It is the real contents of his revelation, and the knowledge of it is the coming salvation: "This is life eternal, that they should know Thee the only true God, and Jesus Christ whom Thou hast sent" (John xvii. 3). By this last word, especially, we understand that the value of Jesus' mission to us is this: It declares God. In Christ we see God, hear Him, enter into dealings with Him.

Under this ambassadorship of Christ comes in the ambassadorship of the ministry. Outside of this revealed plan of salvation gospel preachers are not conceivable. In the carrying out of the scheme of reconciliation they occupy a well-defined place. Their part as workers in and with this plan is well summed up in the words of Christ: "Ye also shall bear witness" (John xv. 27). The Lord's sacerdotal prayer consists mainly of a formal and solemn transfer of his earthly mission to such men, as if it were the charge of a holy consecration in the presence of the Father: "I manifested thy name unto the men whom Thou gavest me. The words which Thou gavest me I have given unto them. As Thou didst send me into the world, even so send I them. I made known unto them thy name, and will make it known, that the love wherewith Thou lovedst me may be in them, and I in them" (John xvii. 6, 18, 22, 26).

This is the inestimable worth of the gospel ministry to the world, that as God came to it in the person of Christ, so Christ comes to it through the ministry, by which the world comes into a real contact with the Christ. This is the place of the ministry, to be the representatives of Him who calls himself the Saviour of the world. This is its work, to bring Christ to men. For this must take place before men can be brought to Christ. This is its mission, to perfect the saving work of Christ in the world.

The ministry can never have too profound a conviction of the necessity of the consciousness of this union between itself and Christ. Not as priests, but as heralds. If one cannot sincerely think of himself as in similar relation to the great need of men as the Saviour of men, he must not pretend to have a conception of, or to address, that need. Upon this point the conviction of a preacher must be clear and decided. The Christ has ascended, and is at the right hand of the Father. He comes not again in person until the judgment. He now comes by his Spirit and by men.

To these men and upon their message He promises the Spirit. Thus, between the man who has the word of reconciliation as its minister, and God the reconciler, the links are complete. The man is nothing, and yet the man is much. He is a voice, and the thought of God is back of him. He is a telephone. In the instrument is neither sound nor sense. It cannot form a syllable, much less propound an idea. As an original expresser of words it is nothing. But as a conveyer of sounds or thoughts, how much it is! How swift, how clear, how faithful as a transmitter! Such is the ideal of a gospel minister, — a man who lets God in Christ speak through him.

This was Paul's conception. His apostleship was a large office. But the essential part in it to him was the preaching. "Christ sent me not to baptize, but to preach the gospel" (1 Cor. i. 17). With an unbounded enthusiasm, and with a singularly deep and simple feeling, he speaks of this privilege: "It were better for me to die than that any man should make my ground of glorying void" (1 Cor. ix. 15). Practically, he subordinated everything to it. His pastoral labors were unbounded. The care of all the churches came upon him. He, more than any other, was consulted about practical questions. He was a great organizer, a great bishop, a great teacher, but he has mainly come down to us as the great preacher. On many questions his opinions are of authoritative value, notably in church government and ethics, but on no topic has he spoken with so much force and decisiveness as on what was to him "the glorious gospel of the blessed God" (1 Tim. i. 11). His epistles are sermons rather than treatises. How full of eloquence! The gospel to be preached was his pride and love, as he had received it at first hand from the Lord Jesus in the very hour in which the beauty of the Lord and his power to save were revealed to him as the chief of sinners. How well he understood where lay the secret of its glory and force! With what fine pride he writes to the Romans: "For I am not ashamed of the gospel of Christ, for it is the power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth." With what splendid courage he speaks to the Jewish court: "Having obtained the help that is from God, I stand witnessing how that the Christ should proclaim light both to the people and to the Gentiles" (Acts xxvi. 22, 23).

If one dwell much in that atmosphere of Paul, he can have no doubt as to what is the real work of the ministry, which gives it value and power. But one can easily get out of that atmosphere into that of ecclesiasticism. Paul's simple sense did not

rule very widely nor long in the Christian church. Opinions, ceremonies, authority, priestliness, were either added to or put in the place of the setting forth of the gospel. Then its servants soon lost faith in the mere announcement of the gospel promise to men, who were to be urged to its acceptance only by an honest manifestation of the love whence the gospel proceeded, but in which its preachers had often but little faith. So the work of the ministry became in time either a playing on men's fears through a show of hurtful power over the bodies and souls of men, or an appeal to their intellects by presenting the gospel as a system of philosophical thought. The more one reads of the uninspired writings of the early church, the more one is struck with this speedy departure from the simplicity which is in Christ, both in theological thought and in the church life.

We have fallen heir to all that. In spite of attempts at purification from time to time, and of successful restorations in some measure of the word of Christ to its real place, the tendency constantly asserts itself in a form to be carefully watched, — either the priestly assumption which puts itself between the soul and Jesus Christ, envious of the freedom which every sinner has to negotiate directly with God in Christ; or the theological assumption, distrustful of the simplicity of the saving process in which love and trust have a larger place than knowledge or reasoning; or the lordly assumption offended at the equality bestowed upon all who truly seek and yield to the Spirit's influence. The Christian church is still full of these obstructions to a really wholesome life. For they bring the gospel into contempt, and give sinners an excuse for rejecting what the church largely despises. It is a sure sign of declension when the simple preaching of the gospel cannot attract saints and sinners to the house of God, — when it must be bolstered up with other means, as æsthetics, or music, or ritual, or any variety of exercises, which please the taste of a particular community. In public worship, all things should be subordinate to the message from God. In a preacher all things must be subordinate to his sense of being a minister. In all times of quickening, therefore, the Word comes at once to the front, and the power of God is made manifest through the living preacher. Men hunger for the Word. The Word comes with power. In Paul's enumeration of the qualities of a bishop, the only one required, besides qualifications of character, is this: "He must hold fast the faithful Word, that he may be able to exhort" (Tit. i. 9). He can afford to be a failure in many respects, if he know how to

speak in the name of Jesus as the Saviour of sinners. He must be a man through whom the word of the Lord can have a free course and be glorified.

In the same manner, the ministry cannot have too high a sense of this consciousness as a test in its practical work. A regulating test of its work is a standing necessity. Ministers must constantly ask: Are we saying what we ought to say, are we accomplishing what we are sent to do? What is the gospel, is therefore never a superfluous question in relation to preaching. Not all that is gospel which rises in our hearts, or passes through our brain, or glides from our lips. Nor is that always gospel which books teach, or learned men propound, or creeds prescribe. Nor is that necessarily gospel which audiences approve or demand. Only that is gospel which issues from the Christ. He is its only authorized prophet. As Paul expresses it, it is "truth in Jesus." To him the gospel and the cross were synonymous. "The word of the Lord" is a large term, and the ministry, as a teaching office, has the range of all of it. But, considered as a preaching office, its proper subject is specifically the gospel in the Word, that is, the proclamation of God's gracious intent towards sinners. Upon this, its central truth, God relies for his influence among men, and upon it we must rely for our success as his ministers. There is a steady tendency to undervalue or to deny this. It is said, men are not fit for its offer; they must be made fit for it through the preaching of the law. Or, men do not need it; turn your efforts to the improvement of their morals. Or, it is of no use, men cannot be interested in it; you must enter the current of their prevailing thought and try to do them good in their own tendency. These are temptations of the Evil One to make preachers unfit and inefficient. It may be taken for granted that the conscience of the world is prepared for the message which Christ sends, for the Holy Ghost has come to convince the world of sin. Therefore a preacher may, must speak to that conscience in the name of Jesus Christ. The consciousness of a single transgression is a sufficient preparation for the gospel message, which is, in substance, the assurance of pardon through Christ crucified. The reliance for the benefit of preaching is to be upon that. The conception of the meaning of the cross is too generally deficient. How it grows upon one, as his own life and a wider experience of the world force upon one the necessity of inquiring more deeply into its significance! I am convinced that no theological system in which the ministry is trained to-day has yet given the promi-

nence to the cross of Christ which it deserves. I am thankful for whatever tendencies the church of our day shows of giving to the doctrine of the atonement, the relation of God in Christ to men, — the human race as a whole, — and to the universe, a more influential place in its system; but I shall not be satisfied until I see a system which makes its first postulate read, "God was in Christ reconciling the world to himself," and shall from that premise deduce a doctrine of God, of the world, of men in all their relations. For only then will there be the full knowledge and acknowledgment of the effect of the cross. It may be long before we see that perfected. No preacher, therefore, need wait until he find it in a text-book of dogmatic theology. But he will find all its materials in his Bible when he has an eye for the gospel. Let him get near to the heart of Christ. "For it was the good pleasure of the Father that in Him should all the fullness dwell; and through Him to reconcile all things unto himself, having made peace through the blood of his cross" (Col. i. 19).

It may be said that to a true gospel minister Jesus Christ becomes more and more the man of his counsel, and the words spoken by his mouth the heart of the revelation by which the whole Scripture is to be interpreted; by which men, the world, the kingdom of heaven, God, must be more fully understood. Then would one be in full sense a minister of the gospel, if he spake to men only what at that given moment the Lord Christ would say for his purpose. Must a preacher, then, confine himself to the recorded words of Jesus? That depends on circumstances. If the nature of the case warrants their use as a complete statement, one need not hesitate to say yes. A gospel minister can find no more fitting terms for his message than the forms which his Master used. But while the prime need of men is identical in all ages, the needs of humanity are enlarged by time, and the questions are multiplied. To-day questions are asked which were not suggested in the time of Jesus, and for which no express answers have been left by Him. So a subsequent generation will propound questions which never enter into our minds, and for which we can leave no directions. None of the problems which relate to humanity must be thought unworthy of consideration or unadapted for solution. In the revelation of Jesus will be found the principles whose honest application will furnish sincere seekers after truth with satisfactory answers in every domain of human interest. It is one of the truest and most comforting lessons of history that the understanding of the

Lord's words has kept pace with the needs of humanity. From age to age it became the source of a steadily growing freedom, knowledge, energy, and inspiration, together with a regularly increasing knowledge of the deeper meaning of that word. The word of Jesus undermined the religion of the Greeks and Romans; it healed the moral rottenness of the first centuries; it civilized the coarse northern peoples; it liberated the darkened intellect of the Middle Ages; it accomplished the liberty and culture of modern society; it gave to our age knowledge and science; and gave to our generation the impulse to explore the unknown world which stretches out beyond us into the dim distance. If, indeed, as some fear, our generation has thrown itself into this new field with a zeal which borders on fanaticism, we may expect that its impetuosity will, after a little, be tempered by this ever-living Word. The Word will be again the test of philosophy, and furnish the solution of the interesting questions with which our day does not concern itself in vain.

It will be great gain, both to the church and the world, when the former shall always offer its honest help to the latter in the investigation of the things worth knowing which concern humanity.

To the preacher the Bible is the real text-book. It must be the spring of his knowledge, the source of his inspiration. In the seclusion of his own field he may find that independence of human influences which is a first requisite for assured knowledge of the mystery of the gospel. Let him open his mind to the influences of the Holy Spirit, which will come to him through the Word, if he honestly seek for the mind of Christ, that he may interpret that to men. Every really called preacher God makes "sufficient as a minister of a new covenant, not of the letter, but of the spirit," and where that spirit is, are both life and liberty. The cross is, in the mean time, his test and safeguard. All knowledge that brings out its power, every word that increases its effectiveness, is divinely approved and of the truth. Whatever makes the grace revealed on the tree more available for the world's sin, sorrow, and suffering may safely be owned and accepted as gospel. What men will do with it is, in a sense, of minor consideration. The preacher need not be in right relations first to men, but to the saving God and his word of salvation. Whether men hear or forbear is of infinitely less account than the question, whether God is honestly and fully represented among men in the claims which his love, as revealed in the sacrifice of Christ, eter-

nally has upon all spiritual beings. That is the tremendous question which is constantly to rest upon the conscience of every minister of the gospel, as it rested upon the soul of Paul. For he is an ambassador of Christ in the ministry of reconciliation.

Now surely this is the ministry of reconciliation, — the announcement on the behalf of Christ that the world has nothing to fear from God, but everything to hope for. The Saviour said it before his death: "*Now* is the judgment of this world: now shall the prince of this world be cast out. And I, if I be lifted up from the earth, will draw all men unto myself" (John xii. 31, 32). Paul has corroborated it: "He hath abolished in his flesh the enmity."

It needs scarcely be shown how the witness of Christ confined itself almost exclusively to the revelation of his Father, in order that the world might learn to think rightly of God, and should feel and do justly as to God. In this is the largest liberty for the putting of all relevant questions, and for the submitting of all real difficulties. That this revelation thus occupies seemingly so narrow a range, is because it is this which men specially lack, and always lacked. God did not send his Christ because there was among men no knowledge of God, nor even because in them there was no consciousness of God. Paul says of the most degraded, "They knew God." And in Athens he joins the Greeks in saying, with one of their old pagan poets: "We are of divine lineage." But the knowledge of God in Christ, that is, of God as Christ represented Him, men lacked. They knew not that "the one God is the Father, out of whom are all things and we unto Him" (1 Cor. viii. 6). Yet that is the only true, adequate, satisfactory knowledge of God. That saving knowledge which Jesus Christ had and gave, by which, as the prophet had already said, the "servant of the Lord would justify many," put them into right relations with God. This is the knowledge which, according to Jeremiah, is the glory of men. "Let him that glorieth glory in this, that he understandeth, and knoweth me, that I am the Lord which exercise lovingkindness, judgment, and righteousness, in the earth: for in these things I delight, saith the Lord" (Jer. ix. 24). No one has greater need than an ambassador of Christ, to look into the character of God with the penetration of the Son of the Father.

The knowledge of God in Christ must also be, to the minister, the key to unlock the secret of man and human history. What humanity is, the man Christ Jesus alone can teach him. Not in its

original character, — for Jesus was more than a son of Adam; He was the new man, — but in the divine ideal. The antithesis between the man Jesus and the man Adam teaches us what was lacking in that first man of the earthly creation. He is of the earth, earthy; the second man is of heaven. In Adam is not yet the end of God's creation. He is only at that moment the acme of a creation in development according to a certain design, — a man capable of mental growth and fit for the communication of spiritual life, but in whom is not yet the absolute triumph of divine virtue, the invulnerability to evil. In his solitariness Adam can be neither happy nor satisfied. He is above every creature, and does not reach to God. In this respect his elevation above the creatures is his misfortune. He does not come to self-content nor to perfect communion with God. The life complement given him in Eve does not fill up his moral life. She becomes to him the occasion of a fall rather than a rise. Together they can find their way to the tree of the knowledge of good and evil, but not to the tree of life. The Paradise state is of short duration, like the innocence of our childhood days. The history proves that Adam is flesh in a too significant sense than that to him can be intrusted the championship between good and evil, then already wrestling for supremacy in this creation. What that flesh means Paul teaches us, who has most fully interpreted for us the word of Jesus, "That which is born of flesh is flesh."

In that first man roots, at least in part, through the perilous bond of the flesh, the moral character of a whole race. In that race, which soon reveals the most disquieting traces of corruption, roots again, with an indissoluble connection, each personal life. This life is not only susceptible of evil, because of its original imperfection, but comes into a sinful world with the inheritance of the evil of ages, and with the hereditary capacity of multiplying sin in itself and propagating it in its generation. The problems which arise out of such a history are always too serious to be dismissed, or even to be postponed. Ministers of the gospel must not hesitate to acknowledge that they concern the character of God and the honor of his name. The feeling that God is responsible for his own creation cannot be suppressed in man by any oracular proscription. It is not the least important part of the calling of ambassadors of Christ to justify the ways of God to men, even as the Christ justified the Father.

We need not listen despairingly to the conclusions of a science which leaves Jesus Christ out of its premises, or out of the domain

of facts, when it apparently degrades our position as earthly creatures. It is not worth the while to dispute about that with its advocates. There may be much truth in the seemingly unworthy representations which arouse the indignation of many. Paul also had no high opinion of this present visible manhood when he called it "the body of our humiliation;" nor of our interior being, our nature (*φύσις*), when he says that in it we are "children of wrath;" nor of our Adamic descent and its promise, when he says that the first Adam was no more than a living soul, a being possessing only psychical life. Over against these the gospel announces a better Man, whose glorified body is the promise of an outward ennobling; by whom we become partakers of the divine nature — *φύσις*; who is to us a vivifying Spirit — *πνεῦμα*. He was the first man who could say: "I came forth from the Father: again I go unto the Father" (John xvi. 28). No, not Adam, *of* whom we are, was the end of God's creation as a rational creation, capable of the permanent indwelling of God; but the man Christ Jesus, *unto* whom we are, is the final end. He exists eternally in the divine plan as the end of the creation. "The Father loveth the Son, and hath given all things into his hand" (John iii. 35).

Do gospel-preachers sufficiently insist upon it that Jesus Christ will not lose the place among men which, by all the proofs which human conclusions furnish, still awaits Him? The virtual Head of humanity will be its acknowledged Head. We are ambassadors for Christ that we may secure this to Him.

The assurance of this truth is a step towards another truth which, in human speculation, lies at the other extreme. There is an indefinite feeling among men that God cannot be permanently separated from humanity. Poets, philosophers, who seek the answer to questions concerning humanity above, rather than beneath themselves, as scientists are inclined to do, often end in a relation between God and the human spirit which confounds God with man. They set men to seek God within their own limits. Let us not suspect, nor discourage, nor mock that searching. It is the distinction of ministers of the gospel to give direction to such quest and to satisfy it. As ambassadors of Christ, they must assure men that they must not only find their real manhood in Jesus, but may find God in Christ, — God not separable from humanity; God become incarnate; God living the life of humanity, and so himself furnishing the proof how these two, so far apart, can become one, and live together a true, undivided,

harmonious life, not only alongside of each other, but within each other; God entering into his creature and identifying himself with it. This is the full meaning and ultimate effect of reconciliation.

Thus Jesus Christ becomes in his person the Reconciler of God and man. His life is the active reconciliation. In that life is the perfect will of the Father perfectly carried out. As Jesus witnessed: "I do always the things that are pleasing to Him" (John viii. 29). At the same time there are in that life our human temptations, our sins, our fear, our sorrows, our death terrors; but the two so dissimilar things are there for a purpose of reconciliation. In that wonderful life, the love of the Father always subdues the self-love which is the strength of temptation. There the sins of men disappear as mists in the glow of that love-light which is always reflected from that spotless Spirit who never forgets to love supremely God and men. There fear and anguish and death-perils are overcome by a confidence which no experiences of dying can shock or diminish. "Father, into thy hands I commit my spirit," completes the atonement, whose real substance is indicated in the self-surrender in Gethsemane: "Not my will, but Thine be done." The complete yielding of himself; the glorifying of the Father as his Father, under all the trying experiences of the last suffering; the perfect love to men, whose cruel maltreatment could stir in Him only a deeper pity, but no impatience or revenge, — there is the atonement. And it can never be rightly considered so much the price of the divine reconciliation as the evidence of the reconciliation wherein God in Christ was reconciling the world unto himself.

Men are ambassadors of Christ to say this out plainly. The atonement does not take place outside of God and outside of man. The Saviour, who had formerly said, "I and the Father are one," does not unjustly nor vainly appeal to the Father thus: "Glorify thy Son, that thy Son may also glorify Thee." That is the prayer fit where the great drama of the atonement reaches its climax in the garden and on the cross. The Father is in that transcendent day of mortal suffering as truly as is the Son of Man. Therefore He is, according to the Scriptures, the gift of God,¹ the Lamb of God;² not a sacrifice to God, but God's sacrifice.³ He died that day unto sin,⁴ not unto God. He lived unto God and

¹ John iii. 16; Rom. v. 8, viii. 32; 1 John iv. 9.

² John i. 29, 36.

³ 2 Cor. v. 21; Isa. liii. 7.

⁴ Rom. vi. 10. Cf. vi. 2, 11; Gal. ii. 9, vi. 14.

the Father saved Him from death.¹ Neither does the atonement take place outside of us. However unique may be Christ's humanity, his is the humanity which is truly ours by the divine purpose, by which he that is in Christ is a new man, which He, as a new creation in the Virgin Mary, unites to our human life. For in our human sphere — men were its witnesses from the beginning to the end — Jesus Christ fights again our battle and conquers, passes through our suffering, endures our death, and rises again by the power of his endless life.

This is, indeed, the sum of the gospel which men are set to preach. If one have an eye for the gospel, he will find the Book full of it, — the exaltation of the cross, and of the Lamb slain thereon, until he finds them in the very midst of the eternal throne, towards which all things are finding their way as to the true centre of the universe; the atonement, not as an afterthought of God to affect merely a small portion of his vast world, the part which has gotten out of the harmony of the whole, but as a forethought, an eternal purpose; the central idea of the eternal plan of God, out of which all things visible and invisible have proceeded; the real thread which binds together all parts of this great creation, in which God is supreme; the unity which makes men and angels members of the same family; the great aim and final end toward which all things tended from the beginning; the marvelous work of God which was the completion of the creation idea, and brought the fullness of time; the culmination of the self-revelation of God, in which the Eternal shows his innermost nature.

It is upon the largest possible conception of the reconciliation which is in God that the preaching of the gospel as the demand of faith is to be based. As an invitation, it must include the greatest sinner; as a demand, it must fit the promise. The promise comes to the race,² the demand to the individual.³ The demand is not based on law, but on the gospel.⁴ It is addressed to the faith of the heart rather than to the faith of the intellect, to trust rather than to belief. It is the voice of a father to his children: Be ye reconciled. In this demand the original ideal relation between God and men is as truly of account as the redemption wrought on the tree. The gospel assumes this original relation, which was never disowned on God's part, and this first

¹ Heb. v. 7; Luke xxiii. 43.

² Gen. iii. 15; Acts ii. 39; John iii. 16, *et al.*

³ Acts ii. 21, 38, *et al.*

⁴ Rom. x. 3-15.

bond, which was never severed. Therefore the love of God has always been manifested, and his tender mercies have always been the proof of his friendship and interest. The cross was the culmination and fulfillment of a history of grace.

Yet there took place a separation, called by such evil names as enmity, when described from the human side, and wrath, when described from the divine side. Thus in Romans v. 10: "For if, when we were enemies, we were reconciled through the death of his Son;" and in John iii. 36: "He that believeth not, the wrath of God abideth upon him." This enmity on the part of man is not called out in the form of retaliation against anything that God has done. It does not, for instance, develop in man upon the discovery or sense that he has been wronged by his Maker, so that one can definitely locate its rise or specific occasion in any one's life. It appears as an innate attitude, in the form of indifference, or impatience, or distrust, or resistance, or antagonism, as called out by perceived demands which oppose the desire or will. It exists where men do not know God no less than where they are acquainted with Him; where men do not suspect that God has harmed them as where they attribute to Him all manner of evil treatment. It is universal. Without faith in God in Christ there is no real love of Him among men. Now, in what relation does the revealed wrath stand to this enmity? Men sometimes seem to think that wrath in God is his response to this estrangement of men. But not so. According to the Scriptures the response of God to human enmity is love, pity, mercy, grace. Therefore Christ could say, "Love your enemies, that ye may be the children of your Father who is in heaven." That is the perfection of the Father. The world hates God; God loves the world. The answer to the enmity of the human race is the Son of God on the cross for the human race. What, then, is wrath? Whatever it be, it is not retaliation, it is not revenge, it is not bitterness, it is not spite, it is not hatred. If it were any of these, God would be like men. We know of no response to hatred but hate; we need love to start love. God is essentially different, and can save his love in the presence of hatred. What, then, is wrath? Wrath is the indignation of love wounded, despised, spurned. Wrath is the justification of love denied, as peace is the evidence of love believed, responded to. Wrath is, therefore, not an original revelation. The first sin was met by the first promise, not by rejection. It is a subsequent revelation. It is revealed from heaven against all ungodliness and unrighteousness

of men *who hold down the truth* in unrighteousness (Rom. i. 18). Therefore we read, "The wrath of God abideth on him that obeys not the Son" (John iii. 36). Hence reconciliation does not take away wrath, it takes away enmities. Faith takes away wrath. After the cross there is no occasion for enmity, real or apparent, but the occasions of wrath may be infinitely increased by it. The great day of wrath lies in the future. In it is the wrath of the Lamb slain for human redemption, and it is displayed in connection with a *rejected* salvation. By sin, which is the cause of this separation, whether original or repeated, God is wronged in his love, in his truth, in his righteousness, all of which are saving attributes, in which men should have had, and always should have, boundless trust.

Now, what is the reconciliation? It is evident that though the heart of God may not change in its fatherly relations towards his sinful children, the relations cannot remain the same after the breach, and that the love cannot show itself in the same way after as before sin. It may be a love of pity, but cannot be a love of approval. God may be gracious, but cannot sacrifice the rights of his righteousness and Fatherhood to human willfulness. To indicate these rights, to establish and satisfy his love, and to win back the love and confidence of his children, God sends the Son of his love. He gives Him to and identifies Him with men, by a sacrifice which only God can measure. By perfect obedience to the fatherly will, by perfect submission to such suffering as is the just and proper element of a life in which sin bears its fruit as an estranged life, He both satisfies those rights and proves that love to be essentially a reconciliation. In his person He actually reconciles God to man, for with the Son of Man, in whom men are reckoned, God is well pleased. There, then, on the cross, the original relation between God and men, which during the ages had been obscured, — buried, as it were, under the mass of human enmity, sin, and all its just results, — comes again into the light; and the cross itself is the proclamation, as it is the proof, that the love of God abides, and is an effective adjusting force in restoring men to the rights and privileges of childhood. But this is only one side of the reconciliation. To make it effective in men, they must as truly be reconciled to this reconciled God; and a minister of the gospel must make this especially clear and enforce it, as an ambassador for Christ. The reconciliation of God needs the reconciliation of man, not to make it true, but to complete it. The failure of response does not, indeed, make the

reconciliation ineffective in him who proposes it. If I have been at variance with a friend, and have become reconciled to him, his continued enmity cannot rob me of the fruits of reconciliation within myself. The sorrow and pain which he may thus give me is apart from the experience of reconciliation. Even righteous indignation at the failure of the full effect of reconciliation cannot destroy the effect in me. This is true. Yet reconciliation must of necessity strive after its full effect, for it is of the essence of love. Although, therefore, it were conceivable that all sinners should refuse to be won, and the reconciliation be effective in God only, yet God being reconciled cannot but desire the mutual removal of all distances and seek to bring men nigh. Hence the gospel demand, *Be ye reconciled*, which, as the apostle rightly says, takes the form of beseeching and entreaty. God takes the attitude of a suppliant, as the Scriptures so often say, stretching out his hands as one that implores, pleading tenderly, and mourning over men as one mourneth over an only son. This is because of the original relation. If God were merely a governor, a judge, a king, and had in that character provided the atonement, He would not do so. He would then publish a proclamation of pardon for as many rebels as pleased to avail themselves of it, and leave it to them, as mainly interested in it, what use they would make of his favor. But being a Father, God is as much interested in the reconciliation of men as they are, and more so; and as much interested in their reconciliation as in his own. No one understands the gospel who leaves out that paternal element, or forgets the parable of the Prodigal Son. God cannot be indifferent to the result of his love. That is impossible to a Father. Why? Because rebellious, callous children deserve so much tenderness and interest? Oh, no. But because to be a Father is to have so much love and deep concern. That is the essence of the gospel, that its tone and urgency. Therefore it abounds so in arguments of love, in words of tenderness. Therefore there is in it so large a place for the cross and a slain Son of God. The Lord Jesus has taught us, in the fifteenth chapter of Luke's Gospel, that reconciliation is as fully a need of God as it is a need of men. Hence this entreaty: *Be ye reconciled*. To be a true ambassador for Christ is to feel and appreciate this divine argument.

This also explains why there is in the gospel so much of the hardship of sin, the danger into which it brings men. That gives room for this peculiar argument of pleading, mingled with author-

ity to make the beseeching effective, — just such pleading as a parent uses with a child in danger, as when a child is in the upper part of a burning building: its only chance of escape is in bravely jumping down that it may be caught, but it dares not, and refuses. Who can untwist in that father's tones the entreaty, the anxiety, the command, the threatening, the indignation, the love, which blend in the demand to overcome distrust and fear, and do as it is bidden? So complex is the gospel, that by any means men might be touched and won to the complete power of the reconciliation. The real basis of that pleading is the bond between the father and the child. Men sometimes speak slightly of the gospel as a mere appeal to fear. They do not understand it, then; and the preacher greatly wrongs the gospel who gives occasion for such an understanding of its motives and appeals. It is an appeal based upon real relationships between God and men. No man ever really responds to the gospel, until he gets a perception of that. Men who only get their own consent to flee to God because it is a choice between hell and God, and they fear hell most, are not likely to find much in God. The present misery of sin, as it robs them of home, must teach them the truth and blessedness of the Father reconciled and waiting for them, with the doors of home and heart wide open. The divinely taught response to the demand of the gospel is this: "I will arise and go to my father, and say to him, I have sinned." The preached gospel must fit that confession of faith.

It needs to be emphasized to-day as the calling of the ministry. The most prevalent objection which the gospel has to sustain is always that against its fullness and freeness. One can always be allowed to say almost anything in the pulpit, so long as he will keep up and strengthen the bars which separate God from man. One can get adherents to almost any notion and speculation sooner than to that of the unconditional freedom of salvation. One can get the consent of men to any terms more easily than to the free grace of God. The offense of the cross has not yet ceased. That is what makes it a hard task to preach the gospel in its simplicity and purity, and not yield to the demand to modify it by the considerations suggested by human fear and unbelief. But it is imperative upon the ambassador for Christ to do this, and, by a constant communion with Christ in the study of the gospel, to come to the assured consciousness which enables him to say with Paul: We have the mind of Christ, — the temper, the feeling, of the blessed Lord, who was willingly nailed to

the cruel cross, because He had faith in the love of the Father as an infinite saving power. All one needs to do, then, is to let the gospel speak for itself, and trust its efficacy to that mighty Spirit who is perfecting the work of God unto the great day of God.

Chr. Van Der Veen.

GRAND RAPIDS, MICH.

SHOP-GIRLS AND THEIR WAGES.

In discussing the question of "Shop-Girls and their Wages," I may take for granted that the general nature of the problem is sufficiently understood. Popular agitation has made most people familiar with it to an extent that enables me to dispense with a minute account of it. But I cannot rely upon general knowledge to fill out the special features of the question which deserve attention, and which must be taken up in the sequel of our discussion. The first point, therefore, to be remarked is the force of usage in fixing the business habits against which the sympathy for woman revolts.

Custom, which has always been a powerful factor in determining wages, independently of all considerations of justice, has placed the reward for woman's labor below that of man for the same work or for the same time. In some cases, at least, there may have been valid reasons for this. But whether there were or not, the effect of the custom upon economical adjustment is such that it is difficult to change it abruptly at the bidding of abstract justice. I do not say impossible, but difficult, because at any given moment the state of business in a particular firm may, for all that the public knows, be hanging on the conditions which this custom presents, and so, in that case, the attempt to demand or enforce abstract justice may take away by insolvency even that which the laborer actually has. In circumstances where woman was not self-dependent, the custom would work less injustice, and the ordinary formula of justice, namely, that there should be an equivalent exchange of services in determining wages, would be modified by the law of competition and individual freedom of action. But not to dwell upon the abstruse side of this question at present, there are numerous factors in modern life, such as the density of population and its relation to natural resources, the concentration

of property, increased facilities for monopolizing the availability of one's producing powers, due, on the one hand, to mechanical improvements, and, on the other, to social and economic solidarity of large areas of territory, and affiliating influences, which have thrown a large class of women upon their own resources, and their condition compels them to face a custom, and if not a custom, certain forces of competition, which the merchant, however he may feel about their injustice, is equally compelled to act upon; and the consequence is a great deal of friction and difficulty in finding a practical solution for a problem which seems and is, theoretically, simple enough. The problem is sufficiently defined by common opinion. This will have it that the wages of shop-girls, sewing-women, etc., are not just, or at least are subject to contingencies which are a perpetual menace to good morals. How can this difficulty be remedied? What possibility is there that woman shall receive the just remuneration for her labor that will prevent her from being placed between alternatives which make the love of life stronger than the love of virtue? This is the plainest way in which the problem can be stated, and the simple answer is: Give her just wages. But this answer is likely to ignore a whole nest of problems more serious than the one we are considering. A rational and practical solution of it, therefore, must be sought in methods which do not conflict with the forces that have hitherto made so many efforts ineffectual.

The methods which have been employed naturally divide themselves into two classes. First, those which represent an organized effort to see that shop-girls, sewing-women, and defenseless female labor in general, shall receive the wages which have been promised to them by employers, and which they have actually earned in pursuance of orders. Second, those which represent an organized effort to advance existing wages, or to prevent their reduction, and the injurious effects of competition, and, in a measure at least, to check the arbitrary power of the employer. These methods are entirely distinct in their nature, purpose, and mode of working, although professing and aiming to effect the common object of justice to a certain class of laborers. But the different degrees of success with which they have met prompts us to consider them separately, both for the sake of the interest which their history and work excite, and more especially for the light which the greater success of the first throws upon the problems of the second method.

The first class of organized efforts to see that justice is done in

the matter of wages generally, goes under some such name as "Working-women's Protective Union." The organization in Chicago is called the "Protective Agency for Women and Children." In Boston, Mass., and Buffalo, N. Y., they have the same name, the "Women's Educational and Industrial Union." But some of the organizations, as perhaps their very names would indicate, represent more functions than others; for instance, in addition to the collection of wages for which the work has been done, they may undertake industrial or educational work, or even combine with these the work of the second class of organizations defined: that of curtailing the injustice of employers who have the power to cut down wages. But it is the method and success of the first class that we wish to notice at present, and we turn to the organization in New York city, known as the "Working-women's Protective Union."

Twenty-seven years ago, in the midst of the civil war, when its evils were felt in more circles than in bereaved families, the sufferings of working-women reached a point that demanded attention. A mechanic resolved on doing something, and sought the assistance and encouragement of a newspaper editor. He had hired a hall, and announced a mass meeting to see what could be done, and desired editorial notice. His wishes were cheerfully seconded, and the meeting was held. The hall was filled with eager, anxious women, but it was only a scene of confusion, and after many hours of debating in the committee, the only remediable difficulty suggested was that of securing pay for work when done. This met a responsive echo from all who were present, and who exclaimed, as if with one voice, "Oh, if we could always get paid for our work, we could get along." Here, then, was the source of the whole complaint. Women were employed to do work, and when the employer had gotten his product he refused to pay for it, and thus secured his profits from unrequited toil. Twenty-five centuries look down upon man since Persian power endeavored to extinguish the liberties of Greece, and perished in the effort. Grecian victory was a step in the direction of maintaining human rights. Rome extended those rights with justice and liberty. Stoicism taught and Christianity realized the brotherhood of humanity, and back their teaching with eighteen centuries of history, and yet man lives upon his fellows, "the dull millions that toil for freedom at the wheel of labor;" and woman comes in, the last, except savages, to reap the benefit of that immense movement in behalf of human liberty and justice. But this is a digression.

The sentiment of the pitiful exclamation we have quoted decided the method to be pursued. It was at once seen that the problem could be solved if the wages contracted for were paid, instead of being unjustly and dishonestly withheld. The committee reported in favor of organized effort to aid the collecting of the payment of just claims by legal process. It was apparent that the complaining women were defenseless, and required only the assistance of some suitable organization which could relieve them of the expense entailed by an appeal to law. The result of the deliberations was a society pledged to this work. It has since extended its work into other fields of allied usefulness, such as the seeking of new and appropriate spheres of labor in departments not ordinarily occupied by women, and maintaining a registry by which those out of work may obtain employment. But the chief work marked out and pursued has been the securing of legal protection for working-women against fraud and imposition. The whole cost of the process is free of expense to the plaintiff. The effort is first made to ascertain whether the wages claimed are really due, and the debtor is given opportunity to settle without a civil process. If he does not, the case is taken to the courts, and the whole sum collected is paid to the plaintiff without any charges. During the first thirteen years of its existence the society prosecuted 5,000 cases of fraud, and collected \$20,797. During the twenty-five years of its existence, from 1863, when it was founded, to 1888, it had prosecuted over 12,000 cases, and collected over \$41,000, averaging nearly two cases and \$3.50 a day. The cost of the work done by the society is about \$5,000 a year, and this sum has to be paid by voluntary contributions from those whose charitable disposition interests them in the work. There have been no general discouragements to contend with, and the honest public has not withheld its sympathies. In the prosecution of unjust employers who have refused to pay the wages agreed to, the society has not been opposed by any fair-minded organizations of business, in so far as its spirit and general purposes were concerned. These facts are decisive indications of its success and usefulness.

But in connection with these observations, it is important to remark certain very significant limitations to its work, which are self-imposed. The society will have nothing to do with strikes and boycotts. It will not use its powers to favor or encourage them, and will do nothing more than give advice to those who may happen to have become involved in them. It undertakes to

settle no difficulties growing out of them, but keeps aloof from such work, and pursues mainly the one work of enforcing the terms of actual contracts between working-women and their employers.

But one other limitation the society imposes upon itself. It refuses to include the complaints of servants in its prosecutions, unless special reasons make them identical with the general policy of the organization. One of the reasons for this refusal is very interesting and significant. The society has found in its experience that nine tenths of these claims prove false, or the servant is to blame for the trouble. Besides, it considers that servants are less defenseless than sewing and working women. The first of these reasons, however, is interesting for the light it throws upon the real source of the difficulty about wages. In the employment of servants the labor is expended in the sphere of economic consumption, not production, and the employer suffers from no such contingencies as accompany the conduction of a business in production or exchange. In this, injustice is just as possible as elsewhere; but it is not as probable, unless circumstances happen to deprive the debtor of the means to pay for service, because the laws affecting the attainment of wealth are different in their operation from those which regulate the use of it. Men have not always the power to shape or control the contingencies of business, and with the fluctuations that threaten their success their minds, dominated by the all-important object of profit, are exposed to very severe temptations, and as commercial principles or practice concede considerable immunity to conscience, if they do not absolve it altogether, it is very easy for the contagion of this laxity to communicate itself to other spheres of obligation. Men who are and must be governed solely by motives of personal interest in the purchase and sale of goods, and who are accustomed to exercise within certain limits irresponsible power over the service of subordinates, will hardly resist the same motives in the purchase and sale of labor, and so will be perpetually tempted to profit as much by taking advantage of the defenseless as by outwitting their competitors. That is, in the world of business there is the law of competition to exalt motives of interest and to subordinate those of abstract justice, while in the work of consumption there is less to disturb one's calculations or to disappoint desire. Hence the temptations to injustice in the latter are less, and servants may more often be the cause of the difficulties which frequently arise, and of which they com-

plain. This difference of circumstances and conditions affecting motives will demand attention when comparing the method under consideration with that of the second class of efforts to protect laboring women. It suffices here to remark that this difference seems to have justified the society in confining its efforts to adjusting the relations between business employers and their defenseless employees; especially when the blame for difficulties in the case of servants, in the large majority of cases, is found to be in themselves.

The success of societies in protecting working-women against fraud has been steady and effectual wherever attempted, and the institution may be said to be an assured thing of the future, as a method which meets the entire sympathy and approval of the public. It is merely the sentiment of justice demanding that voluntary contracts shall be fulfilled. In this there is no difficulty in invoking support.

The Boston society, which is known as the "Woman's Educational and Industrial Union," and which sustains, among several other functions, that of the "Protective Department," reports a similar degree of success and encouragement. But, so far as I can judge from the reports, the organization and equipment of this department is not so good as that of the New York society. This is, perhaps, due to the number of other forms of work which are undertaken. There is the department of social affairs, which endeavors to give working-women suitable entertainments and library facilities; the department of moral and spiritual development, which takes charge of moral and religious instruction; the department for employment, which is a bureau of information and assistance in regard to labor; and the industrial department, which receives and disposes of all kinds of home-made goods, such as bread, pastry, and all kinds of food, fancy and decorative work. But, interesting as it would be to go into the full details of this work, it is not immediately connected with the problem we are considering. It is the nature and success of the protective work upon which we are endeavoring to place the emphasis, in order to compare it with efforts in the direction of increasing wages, as made in organizations of the second class. But, to make clear what this protective work is, and how it is done, we may take a few concrete instances from the reports of the New York and Boston societies.

A working-woman was engaged in retouching chromos, and when the employer closed business he was indebted to the lady in

the sum of twenty-three dollars. When proceedings were taken and judgment rendered against him, he pleaded poverty and disappeared. Poverty, however, did not prevent him from traveling about the country, nor from lodging at a good hotel in New York, nor from dressing richly, nor from riding in a carriage to the opera. When these things became known, the marshal greeted him in his comfortable room at the hotel, and demanded payment of the long-standing debt. Again he pleaded poverty, and asked for delay until an expected remittance should reach him. The marshal's reply was that he should put on his hat and accompany him. "Where?" asked the criminal, in amazement. "To Ludlow-Street Jail," was the brief answer. "Why, you would n't put a gentleman in such a place, would you?" asked the man. "Well," replied the marshal, "you see, a *gentleman* would n't swindle a working-woman. Come along, sir." But this was too much, and the scoundrel paid the twenty-three dollars on the spot.

The Boston society report a very interesting case. A young girl from the Canadian Provinces came all the way to Boston to secure justice, by means of the society, of which she had heard, against a theatrical manager for whom she had done some sewing. She had heard that he was to bring out a play in Boston, and besought the society's aid. As appeals to the manager's mercy and justice had been unavailing, one of the attorneys of the Union arrested him, just as he was to appear on the stage. He paid instantly, the curtain rose, and the audience never knew what had transpired behind the scenes.

If I was to narrate the fifteen thousand similar instances which have occurred in New York city alone during the last twenty-seven years, the reader would have an adequate conception of the work done and the importance of it. But I refer less to its importance and to the need of coöperation with all such endeavors than to the eminent success which these efforts have met, and to the nature of the case which makes the success so great. Those conditions may be briefly stated in the uniform judgment of society that voluntary contracts must be fulfilled. If there is no intention to fulfill them, they must not be made.

Now, when we turn to the second class of organizations, we meet with a very different set of purposes and conditions, and correspondingly different degrees of success. This second class of societies, as I have said, endeavor to control, at least to some extent, the wages which working-women ought to receive. They are often labor unions, although combining other work with

that of managing strikes, boycotts, and exerting pressure upon employers at opportune moments for increased wages, or to prevent the reduction of them. Of the number of associations organized for this purpose, and the particulars of their work, I have not learned enough to enlarge upon them. They have not been so uniformly successful as other societies, and hence have not taken their place among the historical efforts in the direction of the problem under consideration. But it will not be necessary, as perhaps we have not time to go into details. It will suffice to note a few incidents of one of them in our own midst, and to remark the difference between their results and those of the Protective Unions already described, in order to understand why those results have not been so favorable. This society was organized some years ago, and by reason of some internal quarrels went to pieces. Recently it began reorganization, and is to be composed of all working-women who desire to combine, in self-defense, against the power of employers to arbitrarily reduce wages. The specific objects of the organization, which is known as "The Working-women's Society," are thus stated:—

1. To found trade organizations in such trades where they do not exist, and to encourage and assist existing labor organizations, to the end of increasing wages and shortening hours.

2. By using all means in its power, to enforce the existing laws relating to the protection of women and children in shops and factories; and, whenever possible, promoting legislation upon the subject.

3. The abolition of tenement-house manufacture, especially in the industries of clothing and cigars.

4. To investigate and protest against all cases that are creditably brought to its notice of cruel and tyrannical treatment on the part of employers and their managers, open robbery by withholding pay, or underhand theft in imposing fines and docking wages on trivial grounds, etc.

There are several other objects enumerated, but none relevant to our discussion, except the one relating to the necessity of a central society and agitation on the subject of working-women's wages.

The objects presented here are laudable enough, as any one knowing the facts justifying them would recognize. Shop-girls and working-women require some protection against power that will defraud them fully as much as we see is done even when a definite contract is made for specified wages. The same employers

would avail themselves of all kinds of excuses to reduce wages and increase the time of labor. But while we observe that the objects of the society are laudable enough, we do not discover as readily the only means at their command for effecting those objects. Nothing is said about strikes and boycotts in the statement of the society's objects, and we have only to refer to the general experience of the Knights of Labor in such efforts to appreciate the prudence of not emphasizing such a policy, although in a system where the employer may possess power to do injustice to the laborer, there are certainly circumstances where strikes and boycotts may be the only and a legitimate mode of defense. But this can be only when the deliberate injustice of the employer can be, or has been, proved, and this it is always difficult to do. In the general character of the language quoted many would discover evidence of a sympathy with and a tendency to employ that policy, but it is not necessary to reflect reproach upon the society by inferences of that kind, when we are compelled to recognize that it is making an honest attempt to deal with manifest injustice. Above all things, we require here to be fair. Hence we allude to the relation between employer and employee, the friction between whom tends to just such difficulties as strikes, lockouts, dismissals, etc., in order to apprehend exactly what the problem and circumstances are with which we have to deal. This we must state as clearly as possible.

In the first place, the simple, well-known fact is, that thousands of shop-girls and working-women do not obtain sufficient wages to support them, while they give the whole of their available time and services to their employers, and their employers, perhaps, without spending as much exertion or time, are enabled to live in luxury, often, indeed, reaping as much for the reward of their own labor, or idleness, as the wages of their employees together. Common justice would seem to demand that the requital for labor should be better apportioned, and it is the demand for a better distribution of the product of labor that is the source of the organized movements which we are considering. But we cannot understand how this can be accomplished until we know the causes or reasons for the deficient wages of shop-girls and working-women. Every attempt at solving moral, social, and economical problems must take into account the causes of the phenomena to be explained and the evils to be remedied. Deliberate ignoring of these causes can only result in the failure of all attempts to correct the evils of which complaint is made. Hence, in examin-

ing the merits of all methods of protection and social reform, we must first know what the conditions are under which those methods labor, and see that sentiment does not usurp the function of reason in the practical solution of the problem created by them.

The causes of the defective wages under consideration are two, or are of two general classes, and they give rise to two correspondingly different methods of dealing with the question. The first cause is the peculiar competition existing between working-women and shop-girls for the wages received. The second set of causes consists in the moral and economical conditions regulating the operations of trade, and may be comprehended in the competition between capitalists, and the desire of the purchaser or consumer for cheap products. Let us examine the nature and effect of the first cause, and the method of overcoming the evils produced by it.

The competition between shop-girls and working-women presents very unequal conditions, which place some at a great disadvantage compared with others. For example, very many must supply the means of their entire support from the fruits of their labor, including board, lodging, clothing, etc. On the other hand, very many are well enough situated to require very little additional help, or perhaps none at all, and resort to labor for the sake of employing their time or increasing their income. It is their influence on the labor market, or rate of wages, that creates the whole difficulty in the first class of causes we are considering. The wages of a husband, say, will pay all the expenses of the family except the rent of the house. The wife has leisure time at command, and they find that if she can earn fifty cents a day they can maintain their present standard of living, while the wife, perhaps, could not possibly live upon the fifty cents per day. But a part of her necessities being already provided for, she consents to do the work at fifty cents a day because the practical result to her and the family is the same at that rate as if it were more under different circumstances. Again, the daughters of a family may entail expenses beyond the income of the parent or parents, or may see the opportunity for increasing their income by labor, instead of remaining in idleness and submitting to ungratified wants. They therefore accept wages that may pay the cost of their dress, while their board and lodging are provided for in the parents' income. Under these circumstances, what is obtained is so much gained for maintaining the existing status of living, or

improving it. But this class of laboring women is sufficiently large to set the standard of wages for all. They do not have to consider in their suit for wages the whole amount required for self-support, and hence consent to use the whole of their disposable time and services for the difference between what they already have and the sum required. This fixes the rate of wages for the whole class, and those who have to earn the whole of their support must accept the low rate thus fixed or receive nothing at all. It is easy to understand the moral consequences of this situation, and those who have studied the case know facts to which it is impossible to allude, or more than allude, in the present lecture. It is just as evident what the problem is to be solved. It is, What shall be done to counteract the disadvantages under which those have to labor who must earn their whole support? What method will prevent the evils of which every one is conscious?

Some would answer, that those who already have the means of support secured have no right to compete against the less fortunate, and thus drive them to the wall, and perhaps judicious moral influence might diminish the injustice incident to the selfishness which thus improves its own income at the expense of others. But it is clear that no solution of the problem can be effected along this line, because, if for no other reason, there is no means of deciding the standard of living which morally excludes the incumbent from employing his powers at labor, while, on the other hand, the morally best results for society require that every one should be directly or indirectly a producer. But even if it were possible to place either moral or physical limitations upon the right to use one's labor as he pleases, the policy which would endeavor to effect this would be productive of greater evils than those which it seeks to remedy, by placing such restrictions upon human liberty as would threaten the existing social organism with destruction, or reduce it to the chaos and tyranny of ancient despotisms. Hence efforts looking in that direction have not met with any success. But a comparatively easy solution has been applied, and has been wonderfully successful, without casting reproach upon, or interfering with, the liberty of the individual to employ his services at any rate of wages he may desire. It is the method of boarding-houses for shop-girls and¹ working-women whose wages are not sufficient to support them. What we have to say of these will be designed to enforce the conclusion that all rational efforts should, at present at least, be expended in that direction, and not upon chimerical impossibilities.

These boarding-houses have been organized in most of the large cities of this continent. They endeavor to reduce the cost of living for the shop-girl to a sum proportioned to her wages, and so to exempt her from the temptations which are so fatal to virtue. The charges for boarding and lodging are regulated according to the amount of wages received, which, in effect, places the incumbent upon the same plane of competition as her more fortunate fellow-laborer, whose influence in better circumstances decides the rate of wages; or, if the regulations of all of them are not exactly the same, the management is designed to produce the same effect.

Of the boarding-houses in this city I need to say very little. Their number and methods are probably quite well known to all who would be interested in the subject of the present paper. But a few general facts regarding them will be useful in forming conclusions in regard to the purpose they subserve. The original home for self-supporting girls, built by the Ladies Christian Union, is located on Washington Square, and accommodates eighty-five inmates. Its success led to the establishment of branch houses for other classes not so well qualified to support themselves. There is one on Second Avenue, the Laura House, No. 120. Then another was established on Seventh Avenue for girls and salesladies, on Sixth Avenue, Fourteenth Street, and Broadway. The charge for board is only \$2 per week. The Society to Befriend Working Girls has built a home, the Primrose House, on West Thirty-third Street, where the following is the schedule of prices paid for board: —

Those earning \$1 per week pay twenty-five cents; those earning \$2 per week pay fifty cents; those earning \$3 per week pay \$1; those earning \$4 per week pay \$2; those earning \$5 per week pay \$2.50. But, when they reach the sum of \$5 per week for their wages, they are expected to look for new lodgings and board, and give place to those who are more needy.

There are numerous other homes and associations looking to the same end, and they often combine social and intellectual culture with the attainment of this more important object. But we cannot go into details.

The same kind of efforts are made in at least twenty other cities of the country. Two of the institutions in Philadelphia I visited myself, with the purpose of learning the details of their work. The first is the Home on Arch Street, 1117 and 1119, under the charge of the Young Women's Christian Association.

It combines an employment bureau and a boarding-house. It has at present nearly five hundred boarders, and is entirely self-supporting. The bill of fare is limited, so as not to tempt the inmates to go beyond their means, and seldom presents an article which cannot be had for five cents. Only about fifty of the boarders have their rooms in the association's building, and those who are entitled to be received must not be younger than fifteen years or older than twenty-five years. The charges for board and rooms are \$3 per week for those who receive \$5 or less wages, and \$3.50 for those who receive \$5 to \$6. The building is well adapted to the purpose, having a very spacious dining-hall, and being situated near the centre of business. A parlor and rooms for social entertainment are attached, and evening classes are conducted, at which the general attendance is nearly three hundred. A library of eight hundred volumes provides good reading, and every fortnight a lecture or a concert is given to take the place and to relieve from the expense of outside amusement. Last year 139,000 meals were served in the restaurant. The employment bureau in connection with the Home gives its services free. No domestic service is required of the boarders.

The second institution to which I have referred is Walton Hotel, built and supported by Mr. Wanamaker for the benefit of his own lady clerks. It is the old Tilden mansion remodeled and enlarged, and situated on the corner of Brown and North Broad streets. It is arranged to accommodate ninety to one hundred ladies. In the old part the rooms are double; in the annex, or new part, they are single, with suitable bath-rooms on each floor. In the basement there is a large lavatory, for hot or cold water, which it requires six hours to fill. In the attic a large room is used for a gymnasium, dancing-hall, and entertainments. There is also a reading-room furnished with the leading periodicals, such as "The Century," "Harper's," "Scribner's," "Peterson's Magazine," etc. For this the expenses per week, including room, board, and twelve pieces of laundry, are \$3.25.

There is, besides, the Clinton Street Home, under Episcopal patronage, and which contains fifty girls. The charge per week is \$3, including laundry. Then there is the "Temporary Home for Working Girls," which is always full. A fee for board is required, but remitted at discretion.

The same stories could be told of Boston, Baltimore, Chicago, Cincinnati, New Orleans, St. Louis, San Francisco, and other large cities. But to repeat them would only multiply details,

while the incidents already narrated give a sufficiently clear conception of both the nature and extent of the work which is done to solve the first difficulty of the problem. It will be apparent how easily this is accomplished. As indicated, it is simply the policy of placing those whose labor must constitute their entire support upon a level with those whose partial support gives them the advantage in competition. It saves liberty of action, on the one hand, and immoral temptations on the other, while it helps in both to equalize distribution, even if the labor and wages are not apportioned on the natural scale. But one of the most interesting features in the scheme is its testimony to the solidarity of the social organism, and the vicarious methods required to protect its integrity. This is apparent in the following statement of the matter. The competing power of those whose support is partly supplied has the effect of diminishing prices. But what the community gains by this is offset by the contributions of the well-to-do in order to place others upon the same level. This is recognizing the principle of abstract justice without disturbing the organism of society, and without diminishing the usefulness of those who have their whole time and powers at their disposal. But the most important characteristic which I have endeavored to make clear is the simple solution of one half of the problem, to which I think charitable endeavor should more and more direct its attention.

But this solution does not meet the difficulties presented by the second class of causes affecting the wages of working-women, because there are other sources of competition besides that of fellow-laborers, and placing all members of the class on the same level of competition with each other does not remove the influences that affect all alike. For a reduction of wages may be made throughout the whole class, and it may be made to such an extent as to affect all in the same way that the more needy shop-girls are affected by the competition which is not supplemented by charitable help. In that case the problem is not completely solved by the maintenance of such homes and societies as we have described. We must, therefore, examine the nature of the conditions against which the working-woman has to contend, and ascertain what method, if any, offers a hopeful solution of the second class of difficulties.

The second class of causes operating to affect wages is a very complex one. I stated it to be comprehensively the competition between capitalists and the arbitrary power possessed by a firm or

employer. But this will not appear so clear in this generalized form as a correct understanding of the case requires it to be. We must, therefore, resort to explanation and illustration. Now, every one understands the fact that an employer attracts custom by the cheapness of his product, other things being equal; that is, by underselling his competitor. But if the cost of his goods, expenses for carriage, insurance, rent, and so forth, be the same as those of his competitor, it is possible that he can compete with him only when the cost of labor be rated less. In that case, his power of competition will be determined by the rate of wages he pays his employees. In many cases he would get no trade at all, if he could not undersell some one else, and in all cases the total amount of wages paid enters as a factor into the problem of his competition. The more that they intrench upon profits, the less able will he be to compete; and hence the cheaper he can obtain service, the more readily he can compete. Of course if he enjoy an advantage in cheaper rents, insurance, interest, established custom, freight, etc., he will be less tempted to rely upon the factor of wages for determining his rate of profit. But if all these factors are uniform and inflexible, he naturally and inevitably resorts to a reduction, or if not a reduction, the cheapest form of wages possible, less than his competitor, in order to find a market. Now we know that the power to compete may often be determined solely by the rate of wages, and in that case it is clear that the employer must either go out of the business, or obtain a sufficiently low rate of wages to remain in it. Whenever, therefore, the integrity of his trade is conditioned by the wages he pays, and no other factor can be modified, he either avails himself of the competition existing between laborers, or decides the rate of wages which will enable him to continue in business. If the competition between laborers does not suffice to determine the rate he must pay, he must offer a rate and await its acceptance or its rejection. Now it occurs often enough under these circumstances that the interest of the laborer is identical with that of the employer. If the employer goes out of business no labor at all appears in sight. On the other hand, if his terms are accepted, some wages are better than none, and the consequence will be that almost any rate whatever is sure to meet with applicants, and it will inevitably produce its influence upon the rate in the labor market. To refuse the proffered terms is to refuse everything, and to accept them is to accept what is better than nothing. There is no intended injustice on the part of the employer, as the circumstances

are those over which he has no control. However much evil his low rate of wages may inflict, his conduct cannot be treated as an injustice. He might be willing enough to give better, but is precluded from it by the nature of the case. In such cases there is no use to organize for strikes or boycotts, as they will prove ineffectual. They cannot alter the factors of rent, interest, carriage, insurance, cost of production independently of labor, and if the competition between capitalists does not turn on these, but on the factor of wages, which more readily yields to variation, the economic conditions are the key to the problem, and not the injustice of the employers. And yet everywhere strikers and boycotters throw the whole injustice, so called, or the cause of their suffering, upon the employer. In the circumstances presented, the unreasonableness of this is apparent, because the merchant or manufacturer has no alternative. His policy is not a voluntary one. The economic conditions by which he is hampered necessitate his action. Even if his wages offered are not sufficient to provide the shop-girl or working-woman with a living, no organization can possibly raise them from the proceeds of the business, and all attempts to do so must be futile. The only solution of this aspect of the problem is the same as that which equalizes the conditions between those who compete for the labor, and that is to have homes which will provide for the difference between actual and necessary wages, unless we can find that the causes of the difficulty are other than those we have specified. Of that we shall see presently. But it must be emphasized that no organization can possibly effect a rise of wages where the continuance of the business depends solely upon modifications which can be made in wages, or the differences in the rate of wages between separate firms. We discover, therefore, that we have a very different problem from that which confronts Protective Unions, and homes for working-women who are unequally placed in the world of competition, and the ordinary methods of solving it betray their weakness because they do not recognize that it is a different problem.

But we have not stated the whole case. We shall be told that the power to compete in the market is not always determined by the factor of wages, and that, even if it is so determined, the irresponsible and unlimited power over the rate of wages is often abused. This is undoubtedly the case. Business men do not publish the cost of production, or the conditions of expense, which must be more than covered by their rate of profit in order

to carry on a paying business and to make a reasonable interest on their investment. It is very easy, then, for dishonest men, even if they could afford good wages, to pretend that unless they pay low wages they can make no profits. Granting still further that this rate of profit is dependent solely upon the factor of wages, an unscrupulous man, free from the obligation to state the condition of his business, cannot easily be disputed when he decides what rate he will pay. He can assume the position of a man who *cannot* pay more, and the public have no satisfactory data for refuting him. A very slight reduction might be necessary, say five per cent. But, availing himself of the power which necessity confers, he exercises it to a larger extent, and opposition in many cases can have only the force of conjecture upon which to base itself. And he may even use the immunity of his position to increase his rate of profits by a reduction of wages, even when he enjoys advantages enough from a difference between himself and his competitor in regard to other factors. These are instances of undoubted injustice for which the employer is to blame, and not the economic conditions. They as undoubtedly occur very often, and the sympathies of all good people must go with those who suffer from them. The victims of such injustice deserve commiseration and defense. But what shall be the method of extending them help? This is the serious problem. Shall we say, a union of all shop-girls and working-women to control a strike or boycott against such offenders? This method has been tried, and although its success has not been promising, the organizations which are endeavoring to avoid the mistakes committed by those methods, nevertheless aim to direct their action and influence so as to effect a similar pressure. But two very important questions require asking here. Do such societies know enough about the economic conditions of the employer's business to say when the injustice he inflicts is voluntary, or when it is a business necessity? Have they any means of deciding whether a reduction of wages is due to economic conditions or to the arbitrary power of the employer? It is possible that they may have in some cases; and when their knowledge is assured, the public sense of justice has not failed to sympathize with action that would otherwise be questionable. But they are often unqualified to ascertain the conditions of business success, and in cases where their demands have been conceded they may have obtained a temporary advantage, but quite as often has this concession terminated the growth of the business, which gradually succumbs to its rise elsewhere, and

nothing is gained in the end. We may say that, generally, they know too little of all the conditions of business to use this method without discrimination. They require to know as much about one case as another, and to be as free from selfish interests and the temptation to abuse their powers as those against whom they direct their action.

But the second question must be considered. Granting that their knowledge of the circumstances may sometimes be sufficient to justify their methods, the question occurs, Can this method of dictating what wages shall be, be applied so as not to attack those who are in no way to blame for the low rate of wages? How does the method discriminate between those who are compelled by economic conditions to reduce wages, and those who avail themselves of their power to reduce them unjustly? If it does not discriminate between them, it is likely to commit one injustice to balance another, or to undertake an impossibility, and so come away with the prestige of failure to weaken its influence where its claim happens to be just. The inability to distinguish between those cases determined by economic conditions and those determined by moral causes, the danger and probability that personal bias and interest on the part of uninformed working-women, or laborers generally, and the inability to apply a method to moral offenders which will not inflict injustice upon the economically helpless and unfortunate, are insuperable difficulties in every effort to exert pressure upon employers. Undoubtedly it is desirable to restrict their power to inflict injustice, but it is a question whether the methods resorted to do not inflict an equal injustice upon others, and whether arbitrary power in the hands of laborers may not be as dangerous as the same power in capitalists.

But this criticism of the methods employed to obtain living wages, to increase them, or to prevent their reduction, is not designed as a defense of business methods and unscrupulous men, nor as a condemnation of the societies described and their aims. These organizations have an object which is legitimate enough, and even if their methods are exposed to objections, they are honest endeavors to correct an admitted evil. They deserve more sympathy for that than do those who, knowing the cause of the evil, are indifferent to its correction, and hence any one who merely finds fault with those efforts without providing a better solution of the problem may be justly exposed to the suspicion of either truckling to the interests of wealth or of lacking in moral sympathy for the victims of injustice. But it is one thing to

sympathize with the ends sought by such organizations, and another to agree with their methods. What we are insisting upon here is the futility of all methods which suppose that the fault lies wholly in the power and action of the employer, and if we have made, or can make, this clear, we may successfully divert attention to certain other facts which a true solution must take into account. Public opinion too commonly assumes that the fault lies in the employer alone. This is not the case. But we must not hastily infer from this fact that the shop-girls, working-women, or laborers are to blame because the employer is not, or may not be. It is quite possible that fallibility is as much a weakness of the laborer as indifference to right is a fault of the employer. But the general mistake has been in looking for the causes of the difficulty solely in the relations between the employer and the laborer, and so in adapting remedial efforts to that supposition. But we may well insist that the weaknesses and failures of those efforts are proof that all the circumstances have not been taken into account; that the true causes have not been understood. What are those causes?

Hitherto we have considered only the economic conditions of business, and the moral character of the employer. But there is another factor too often neglected which itself is the basal one, and which determines the action and conduct of the business man. It is the readiness of the public to go where it can strike the cheapest bargains, without asking how its purchases affect the services and wages of the laborer. We all go where we can buy the most cheaply, quality of product being the same. But we never stop to ask what the conditions are which produce the cheapness, when they may be simply the reduction of wages to the laborer, or the low rate of wages. This demand on the part of the purchaser is practically the regulator of the employer's action. He must adapt himself to it or give up his business. He is not an independent unit in society, whose action can be taken alone and judged. It is only a part of the whole, and must be adjudged with the conditions which determine it. Hence we cannot lose sight in this problem of the motives and actions of purchasers, who are as much *particeps criminis*, in many cases of injustice due to low wages, as the merchant or employer. They are simply acting upon the maxim which is so often condemned in the laborer, that of doing as little work as he can for as much pay as possible. They are trying to satisfy as large a number of wants as possible with the least possible amount of money; and

the fact that the transaction is concealed under the name of dollars and cents prevents the detection of its real character, which is simply that of obtaining the largest amount of service with the least possible returns for it. They are purchasing goods and asking no questions as to the consequences to those whose services are involved in the exchange. If, instead of trying to get them at prices which are at the expense of the laborer, the shop-girl, and working-woman, they expressed and acted upon a willingness to pay full value for the services involved in the production of the goods, they would exempt themselves from all blame or share in the evil consequences of cheap prices, which fall upon the laborer.

But it will be said very justly that all this is impossible; that the only practicable rule in business must be the voluntary contract between purchaser and seller, and that no available or known means exist for reckoning, in the infinitely complex system of business, the *just* prices of goods. Hence, in pointing out the causes of the injustice to the laborer, we are not condemning the practice of getting goods as cheaply as possible, in any sense that would imply its remediability by law. We are only trying to show that the causes are deeper than ordinary methods assume, and that no solution of the problem under consideration is possible which does not reckon with those causes. It may be necessary that the demand for cheaper prices should exist, and on the other hand it may be an evil to be deprecated, and if possible corrected. But it is not necessary for the present discussion to decide this question one way or the other. It is sufficient to point out the incongruity between the desire and practice of buying goods at prices which inflict injustice upon shop-girls and working-women, and then throwing all the blame for it upon the employer. As long as we claim perfect immunity in the purchase of goods at prices that are indifferent to the rights of others, it is a very ridiculous spectacle to rise up in indignation against the merchant who has no alternative to granting our demands. This simply means that, if we are earnestly desirous of solving this question, we must ourselves be as ready to do our share in the act of justice as we insist the employer shall be. Any attempt to settle the question which disregards this fact is doomed to failure; and it is only amusing to see people straining themselves to buy goods at low prices in order to ride in ease and luxury about Central Park, and then joining societies to protest against the low wages of shop-girls. If the employer *must* give better wages, and if the pressure to compel him to do it is rational, the reform must begin

with the purchaser, or it can never be effective. For, as the pay ultimately comes from the consumer, he must give it in order that the employer may also do it. This is the whole case in a nutshell.

This fact, that the first cause of the difficulty is the conduct of the consumer and not the merchant, enables us to see very clearly why all pressure upon the merchant is misapplied, and to indicate the only method by which the problem can be solved, if it be capable of solution at all. Every solution must reckon with the true conditions of business, and with all the conditions. We have indicated how the protective union solves that produced by fraud and failure to fulfill contracts. We have indicated also how the boarding-home and cheap restaurant solves the problem of unequal conditions and competition between differently situated laborers. But the one now requiring solution is a very different one. The initial causes lie in the action of the consumer, not in that of either the employer or the laborer, and hence remedial methods must deal directly with those causes. But there are only two possible methods which can promise any relief. The first is, that the consumer or purchaser be made, or be willing, to pay higher prices for his goods, or prices which will enable the shop-girl and working-woman to obtain living wages. This, in its real meaning, is that every member of society should do his share of the world's work, and take no advantage of the wants of others to exact from them services for which an equivalent is not given in return. As moral instruction, this is, no doubt, very good, and it may not be questioned that, if consumers could be reformed by any practical method, the problem would seem easier. But when we face the matter of eliminating from the motives of life so large an amount of personal interest, and the fact that there is no absolute standard, either of living or of the cost and value of goods, we truly discover a problem which may very well strike despair into the hearts of the most optimistic. Certainly, if we wait for any solution of it by obtaining a just measure of conduct from purchasers, or a method which will enable them to consider beforehand the consequences of their bargains, we shall have waited a long time to realize Utopia, and must expect development to elicit a larger amount of infinite intelligence than past history gives us any reason to hope for. It is true that moral reformers in this direction are very much needed, and much may be accomplished by them. The results of effort towards modifying the conduct of consumers are worth working for. If men and women can be

made conscious that the consequences of inconsiderate purchases may defeat the very ends of justice which they so desire when contemplating the evils of low wages to shop-girls, they may be induced, at least to some extent, to make the personal sacrifices at this point which charity demands of them to relieve from suffering, and to prevent the evils which their inconsiderateness produces. In this connection, as indicating some consciousness of what must be done to remedy matters, it will be interesting to remark that some societies are organizing consumers' leagues, for the very purpose of realizing this end. The New York Working-women's Society has done so. But progress must be very slow in this direction unless people become practical Christians more rapidly than they have during the last eighteen centuries, and so little can be hoped for from the method which would aim to revolutionize the conduct of consumers, that we may as well look in the second direction for a method that may at least supplement this, and that will promise more immediate relief to the classes whose cause we are pleading. This, again, is the boarding-home, which will provide enough to make up for deficient wages. This system may have its faults. We shall not deny it. But, if society insists upon unrestricted liberty to make its purchases without reference to their consequences to labor, — and we would defend that liberty, — it must be asked to share its savings with those who are the innocent victims of its policy. The only way in which the consumer can make amends for his share in the injustice inflicted is to contribute at one place or in one way what he will not pay in another. If, then, we cannot appeal to his moral convictions to induce him either to pay a just price for his goods, or to contrive a method by which just prices can be determined, we may use the pity and sympathy which he feels for the shop-girl, and the indignation which he rather inconsistently expresses against the employer, to obtain by charity what he will not pay in the price of goods. In some way he must be called upon to balance the inequalities of life, and he may choose whether he will do it by reforming the methods of business, or by voluntary contributions to those whose services and low wages have come as a blessing to him.

This, however, it will be observed, is the solution which charity proposes, and charity is no ultimate solution of any problem. The French proverb well says that "charity creates half the misery it relieves, and cannot relieve half the misery it creates." Contributions from the community, voluntary or otherwise, may

equalize the fortunes of different classes of working-women and shop-girls who compete with each other on unequal terms, and they may enable those who get less than living wages to supply their necessary wants, *but they do not prevent the influence of that competition which affects all classes alike, and which tends to reduce the actual wages obtained, and to increase the demand for charitable assistance.* This competition is that which comes from the growth of population. This may be more rapid than the means of subsistence, and in proportion as it is so, pressure is exerted to diminish the dividends of production. This simply means that the competition which ultimately determines the rate of wages comes from the ratio between population and natural resources, the availability of labor remaining constant or proportional. Now, natural resources and their fertility do not increase. They may not be cultivated to the full extent of their capacity, but there is no increase in them with the growth of population. There may be greater production, but this is not a creation of original resources. On the contrary, it is rather a partial consumption or destruction of them. But, this aside, the increase of population, when resources remain constant, only multiplies the number of those among whom a given amount can be distributed, and the dividends must proportionally decrease. This is the principle to be recognized in the labor problem at large, and we have only to specialize it to see its application to working-women and shop-girls. The amount of labor for them is ultimately a fixed quantity, and if the number of competitors for it is increased the dividends must be smaller; that is, their wages must decrease. Now, if their necessary wants at a given period are partly supplied from outside help, the force of this competition will fall upon the wages thus received, and create the necessity of either lowering the standard of living or of supplying the whole of it from the funds of charity. This means that the methods of assistance we have discussed can be no more than partial solutions of the problem, or temporary aids in the alleviation of suffering. They do not strike at the root of the difficulty, and no method can do so which does not grapple with the problem of population. All efforts at improving the wages of labor which do not reckon with this question are doomed to failure. There is no use to indulge in sentimental optimism on this matter. The laws of nature do not wait upon human wishes, but fall with terrible vengeance upon all who ignore them; and while we do well to mitigate by temporary expedients the evils incident to the struggle for exist-

ence, we must expect no ultimate solution of our problem except by a method which will put limitations upon that fearful factor in human life. If we would realize the ideal result which is evidently involved in the sympathy for those who suffer evil or injustice, we must first remove the cause of them. This cause is the increase of population. As long as this condition is not removed, the evils of which all complain must either remain or multiply. Boarding-homes and protective unions are good and commendable, but they do not solve the problem. They only postpone the final penalty for ignoring the question of population, the most tremendous moral question the human race will ever be called upon to consider. I am not able to present a method of solving the problem with this matter of population in view, but it is important in concluding this paper to learn where the ultimate solution lies, in order to avoid misplacing confidence in methods which are only makeshifts, good enough to appease our sympathies for suffering, but not to remove the causes of it. We can only ameliorate evil, but cannot prevent it, by the methods we have discussed, and there is no use to shut our eyes to the seriousness of the conditions created by increasing population. Shrieks of madness at capital will not amend matters, unjust as the influences may be which come from the power it confers. Pressure has to be exerted somewhere in order to keep population within the limits of natural resources, and it is only a misfortune that this pressure cannot be more evenly distributed. But as the outcry against capital is most vigorously supported by those who are either ignorant of the conditions of life or deficient in self-control, the policy of nature is hardly censurable if its severity is applied where its influence is most needed. Of course, these remarks apply to the whole labor movement at large, so that the problem of wages for working-women and shop-girls is only one case in the larger question, and can press for solution only along the lines of the general subject. But it shows how every consideration of it brings up against the final barriers to the solution of the problem, unless we reckon with the matter of population. The struggle for existence must play havoc with human morals as long as there are no limitations to its influence. Moralization begins where a limit is imposed upon that struggle, or where there is no perpetual encroachment upon the higher aspirations and achievements of the individual. But the measures which will effect this limitation must be either very drastic, or exhibit greater moral power and earnestness than anything history yet presents. The task here is a herculean one,

and might well appall the most courageous. But it is vain to expect any diminution of the pain and suffering due to the competition for the dividends of production as long as the encroachment of population upon natural resources increases the struggle for existence. Protective unions and boarding-homes will do a good work, but they will not meet the difficulties presented by increasing population; and if we are to make anything like progress in solving the problem, we may as well see what it is, and open our eyes to the conditions that call for very serious reflection. As we approach the abysses of this question, the outlook is not an optimistic one. And, with Schiller, —

"Wer erfreute sich des Lebens
Der in seine Leiden blickt."

Still, if only the majority of humanity could be made to see the nature of the problem, the moral earnestness which has done so much might be made available for effective work far in advance of present achievements. But it requires to direct its efficiency upon a point which is wholly unconsidered in ethics, and only mentioned in economics.

J. H. Hyslop.

COLUMBIA COLLEGE, NEW YORK.

THE EDUCATION OF THE INDIANS.

UNDER date of May 4, 1493, so soon after the discovery of America, Pope Alexander VI. obligated Ferdinand and Isabella to furnish Christian education to the Indians in the newly discovered countries, by sending out to them wise and godly men as teachers.¹

During the following year Isabella "directed that great care should be taken in the religious instruction of the Indians." When Philip III. of Spain made a grant of New Mexico, in 1602, to Don Juan de Oñate, and allowed him "200 soldiers, horses, cattle, merchandise, and agricultural implements," he ordered that "six priests, with a full complement of books, ornaments, and church accoutrements," should accompany the colonists, for the Christianization of the natives. And when, in 1626-27, Cardinal Richelieu inaugurated the magnificent scheme of "The One Hun-

¹ "Deum tinentes, doctos, peritos et expertos ad instruendum incolas et habitores prefatos in Fide Catholica, et in bonis moribus inbuendum," etc.

dred Associates" to take possession, for France and the church, of the entire territory from Florida to the Arctic, and from Newfoundland to the heads of the St. Lawrence, he incorporated this article into the charter: "For every new settlement, at least three ecclesiastics must be provided." In 1588 a society was formed in England for introducing Christianity among the North American Indians, to which Sir Walter Raleigh contributed £100, which is thought to be the first donation in England for foreign Christian missions of the Protestant type. Drake says that "nearly all the royal charters and patents issued for British North America were ostensibly for Christianizing of the Indians."¹ A remark of the eminent John Smith, of the Virginia Colony, would imply that a selection of the colonists was made with reference to this missionary work, for he says: "Much they blamed me for not converting the savages, when those they sent me were little better, if not worse."

It may be said, in a general way, that zeal for the church and its extension in the New World characterized those very early schemes for emigration and colonization, yet with a general failure.

Major Amos Stoddard, our first governor of the Upper Louisiana, qualified to speak from an exceptional experience, and after a hundred years of colonial evangelization, says: "The Indians are what they were when America was first discovered by the Spaniards, except those who have had any considerable intercourse with the whites, which has invariably tended to debase and corrupt them."²

Congress often made liberal appropriations for Indian education; and in compensation for lands acquired from them by purchase and removal, the government often had wise forecast, and stipulated that the money to be paid to the Indians should be retained in the hands of the government, and certain portions of its income be devoted to educational purposes.

Thus \$30,000 was conditioned, out of the income of the Indian lands sold in Georgia, to be devoted to school purposes annually among the tribes removed to the Indian Territory. This allowed more money annually, *per capita*, among the Cherokees, than any State in the Union raised for the education of its white children. This statement was promulgated by missionary officials for that

¹ Drake's *Indians*, book ii. p. 112.

² *Sketches, Historical and Descriptive, of Louisiana*, by Major Amos Stoddard, p. 410.

field, to the credit of missionary success, and it was thus left to the impression that the Cherokees had advanced so far in the line of civilization and of education as to exceed the whites in appropriations for educational work. This was not fully fact, since this amount of appropriation was an enforced payment for such purposes, and reluctantly made under an old compact with government. When I was among them in 1880, there was much of manœuvre and struggle to alienate this investment for general purposes. At the time of the above-named visit, the "Five Nations" had been the pet beneficiaries of the government for sixty years, and yet six sevenths of their dwellings were log-houses, huts, shanties, and caves.

Dartmouth College had an Indian school incorporated into its foundation, but it was largely in name, and its pupils were few. When the great constitutional question for the existence of that college was about to be tried, President Wheelock wished to make a show of Indian pupils, and he went over the Canada border to borrow some for his purpose. When crossing the Connecticut, they came in sight of the college building, and it looked so like a fort, and was so suggestive of a prison, and they had withal so many suspicions of the treachery of the whites, that they plunged into the river and struck out for the Canadian shore and forests. President Wheelock called in vain for their return. He, however, had illustrated the motto of the college: *Vox clamantis in deserto*.

But Webster gained the case for the college all the same. The first brick building on the grounds of Harvard was called the Indian College, built by English funds, and was designed for the accommodation of twenty young red men; but, says Mr. Ellis, "the attempt was earnestly made, and carried through its various stages, with but slender and wholly unsatisfactory results."¹

In 1675 one Indian was made a bachelor of arts at Harvard College; yet the coincidence is singular, and somewhat an index of our treatment of the race, that the same year the General Court ordered that "hereafter no person shall harbor or entertain an Indian." Bancroft says that no pains were spared to teach them to read and write, and in a short time a larger proportion of the Massachusetts Indians could do so than the inhabitants of Russia in our day. This was in 1675.²

¹ *The Red Man and the White Man*, by George E. Ellis, pp. 25, 26. Little, Brown & Co. Boston, 1882.

² Bancroft's *History of the United States*, ii. 94.

In 1778 the Delaware treaty contemplated an Indian State, saying: "It is further agreed on between the contracting parties . . . to invite any other tribes who have been friends to the interests of the United States to join the present confederation and to form a State, whereof the Delaware nation shall be the head and have a representation in Congress."¹

This august and benevolent scheme contrasts painfully with the present pitiable remnant of the Delawares, who in 1885 were scattered among eight or ten agencies, and numbered seventy-eight souls, mostly on the Red River in the Indian Territory. In 1819 John Johnson, Indian Agent for Ohio, reports: "The Delawares were once very numerous and powerful, but many disastrous wars with the whites reduced them to a mere handful. . . . They are more opposed to the gospel and the whites than any other Indians with whom I am acquainted. . . . Their peculiar aversion to having white people for neighbors induced them to remove to the westward." There may have been an anticipation of such an Indian State when the first measures were taken that have resulted in forming the Indian Territory. After the Louisiana purchase in 1803, a Congressional act in 1804 provided for the removal of the Indians on the east of the Mississippi River to territory on the west of it, and the five great tribes or "nations" were finally located in it. Possibly the labored, suggestive, and more or less seminal report of John C. Calhoun in 1818 had such a scheme in view, when he proposed two large reservations west of the Mississippi, on which all the Indians could be gathered, — one in the northern and one in the southern section of our vast and unoccupied domain. Only one was formed, and now is this Indian Territory, in which are gathered about forty of the old tribes, or the remnants of them, and original hopes and plans perished. The semblance only is left, like the gold-colored chrysalis of the butterfly after the living occupant has burst it and gone.

When James I. granted the patent for Nova Scotia, in 1621, he speaks of the countries "either inhabited or occupied by unbelievers, whom to convert to the Christian faith is a duty of great importance to the glory of God." In the charter of Massachusetts Bay, 1628, it is enjoined on the colonists to live such godly and moral lives as "may win and invite the natives of the country to the knowledge and obedience of the only true God and Saviour of mankind and the Christian faith, which in our royal

¹ *Laws of the United States*, Duane, ii. 304.

intention and the adventurers' free profession is the principal end of this Plantation." To this end Cradock, the governor of the Bay Colony, enjoins it on Endicott, the head officer, in these words: "We trust you will not be unmindful of the main end of your Plantation by endeavoring to bring the Indians to the knowledge of the Gospel; . . . that you have a diligent and watchful eye over our own people, that they live unblamable and without reproof; . . . and also to endeavor to get some of their children to train up to reading, and consequently to religion, whilst they are young; herein, to young or old, to omit no good opportunity that may tend to bring them out of that woful state and condition they now are in." So in the charter of Charles II. to William Penn, in 1681, we read of the "commendable desire to reduce the savage natives by gentle and just manners to the love of civil society and the Christian religion." In general it may be said that these good purposes and plans for the education and elevation of the Indian in civil and religious life pervaded the colonial grants and instructions as an animating and even leading principle.

Results here force themselves painfully on our attention, in contrast, in a record of stupendous failures.

If any State should show good results in Indian civilization, it is certainly Massachusetts, where the object has secured so much thought and sympathy and labor and money, and where the two races were for so long time intermingled or were in juxtaposition. The last exhaustive and itemized report on the Indians in this State was made to the legislature in 1861, by which it appears that there remained within the Commonwealth the shreds of ten bands, yet showing nowhere one drop of pure Indian blood in their 1,600 people. They had no rights at the polls, were quite intemperate, immoral, unambitious, and during the preceding ten years had received state charities to the amount of \$29,964.37, not including school money.¹ And if an old Indian cornfield yet remain under the cultivation of the aborigines between Plymouth Rock and the Rocky Mountains, it must be at the extreme western point to which the intrusion and cupidity of the whites have not yet attained. The mortifying declaration of the "Edinburgh Review" stands uncontradicted as to the assimilation and civilization of the aborigines: "It has been tried by the French, it has been tried by the English, and it has been tried by the Americans, and in every case the natives have been swept away by war, dis-

¹ *Massachusetts Senate Document 96, 1861.*

ease, and famine, and the whites have exhibited a frightful mixture of all the vices of civilized and savage life.”¹

With a steady failure as a whole, for 250 years, to perpetuate the Indian tribes, and to civilize, educate, and Christianize them; with but a humiliating success in engrafting on the Indian stock the industries of the whites; with a progressive and almost total extinction of Indian titles and absorption of Indian lands westward to the Mississippi; and with the same white unfriendliness in the civilization and settlements on the borders of the Indian belt and reservations, we are confronted with the question, What next?

Mr. Dawes is reported as saying that “what has been done in the past is of no use except to teach us that something different is needed in the future.” We seem as yet to have made progress in the theories and practice of Indian improvement only on the agnostic side.

Our forecast, therefore, for the aborigines of North America is not only not fascinating or encouraging, but is rather shadowed over by dark omens. We cannot forget the hopes and plans and the various arduous works of the 250 years, and the practical failure of them all. We would have more heart for the future if we had united our forces to native, aboriginal forces, and produced one statesman who could grasp the condition of the red man, and rise to the emergency of his race or make an occasion for their uplifting. We have had scarce a half dozen like Red Jacket or Black Hawk, Tecumseh or Ouray, and even these few were no product of white labor. Mental drill has done but little work for the Indian.

A very able and perhaps the best historical disquisition on the red man, as it is one of the latest, is by George E. Ellis, who sums up the opinions of the observers and students on this theme by saying that “the consenting opinions and judgment of the very large majority of men of actual knowledge and practical experience of the mature Indians is, that they cannot be civilized.”²

This summary of Dr. Ellis continues: “There is in the heredity and the organization and birth-type of an Indian, in his tissues and fibre, in his elementary make-up, in his aptitudes, limitations, disabilities, proclivities, and drift of nature, a constitution which

¹ *Edinburgh Review*, vol. lxxxii. No. 165, p. 243.

² *The Red Man and the White Man*, by George E. Ellis, pp. 495, 496, 594. Boston, 1882.

assigns him to savagism, and bars his transformation to a civilized state. In these respects he has qualities inherent, congenital, ineradicable, answering to those respectively of stock animals in the field and wild animals in the jungle; qualities like those which are specific and distinctive between fruit and forest trees, wild shrubs and berries, which lose their flavor under cultivation."

Dr. Ellis with much frankness and fullness states the dissent of an important minority, and for himself says: "Any hopeful work in the civilization of the Indians must satisfy itself with effecting the results with the third generation from the present full-grown stock; and that we must be content with accepting fragments, degrees, and stages of full civilization as all that we are likely ever to realize in those of Indian blood."¹

In his "Life on the Frontier," Major J. S. Campion says: "That there is a radical mental difference between the races is as certain as that there are physical ones. . . . The Apache cannot be developed into a civilized man; he must give place to him. His extinction is justified by the inevitable logic of the fitness of things." "Every country has, perhaps, had its true wild man, — tribes incapable of civilization; some countries have them yet."²

General Custer is more pronounced even than Major Campion: "Study him, fight him, civilize him if you can, he remains still the object of your curiosity, a type of man peculiar and undefined, subjecting himself to no known laws of civilization, contending determinedly against all efforts to win him from his chosen mode of life. He stands in a group of nations solitary and reserved, seeking alliance with none, mistrusting and opposing the advances of all. Civilization may and should do much for him, but it can never civilize him. . . . He cannot be himself and be civilized; he fades away and dies. Cultivation such as the white man would give him deprives him of his identity. Education, strange as it may appear, seems to weaken rather than strengthen his intellect. . . . My firm conviction, based upon an intimate and thorough analysis of the habits, traits of character, and natural instinct of the Indian, and supported by the almost unanimous opinion of all persons who have made the Indian problem a study, and have studied it, not from a distance, but in immediate contact with all the facts bearing thereupon, is that the Indian cannot

¹ *The Red Man and the White Man*, p. 614.

² *Life on the Frontier*, by Major J. S. Campion, p. 355, *et seq.* London edition. 1878.

be elevated to that great level where he can be induced to adopt any policy or mode of life varying from those to which he has ever been accustomed, by any method of teaching, argument, reasoning, or coaxing which is not preceded and followed closely in reserve by a superior physical force. In other words, the Indian is capable of recognizing no controlling influence but that of stern, arbitrary power."¹

However hard and discouraging the sentiments now quoted may seem, it must be said that as a general thing they express the views and feelings of the people beyond the Mississippi, if not beyond the Alleghanies. That is to say, they express the sentiments of the larger part of the people of the country. Government in the United States is the voice of the people, and, to the extent now indicated, the people have decided against the Indian.

The opinions of the army are probably fairly embodied in what we have quoted from Major Campion and General Custer. But the army is in necessary antagonism to the Indian, is naturally adapted to develop their most offensive qualities, and bring to light the discouraging features. Cavalry and artillery and rifles are not the best fitted means to bring out the elements of civilization in a savage race, nor are they eminent means of grace to bring them into a Christian state. The law of an army is mainly that of force, and bayonets will not push a beastly rabble up into first-class citizenship. A total dissent must be entered against the general's dictum that "no controlling influence but that of stern, arbitrary power" will avail in handling the Indian race. Too much of colonial and pioneer and frontier history is to the contrary. There have been Indian patriots and statesmen and warriors who have held their ground to the last, and died nobly, and won laurels that will not fade. Such were Pontiac and Tecumseh. "Peace hath her victories," and by them the great fields of civilization have been won. And it is no bold thing to say that the American Indian has not had a fair chance to take on civilization. Their very success has made them offensive. Indian farming is a good theory with the whites, if it be afar off. The Calhoun treaty of 1819 recognized the Cherokees as "persons of industry and capable of managing their property with discretion." But that was in the wilds of interior Georgia, into which white interests had not advanced. Then, as

¹ *My Life on the Plains*, by General G. A. Custer, U. S. A., pp. 11, 16, 102, *et seq.* 1876.

always, smoke from the white man's cabin was a signal for that of the wigwam to disappear.

Of course the extinction of the Indian race is possible. There are more extinct than extant peoples on the earth. How many of those named by Herodotus and Rollin and Gibbon can now be identified with any living nation? How many of the forty provincial conquests of Great Britain will escape absorption and maintain their identity and have a final autonomy? In this regard the Thirteen Colonies are a rare exception, if not solitary, among the English-speaking people in general. The type of modern civilization is not advanced enough to bring up a nation as we bring up children from infancy to rounded individual and independent manhood. But it is neither fair nor just to say that the thing cannot be done with these low-grade nations. Custer, Campion, and a semi-barbarous white portion can only say that we are not capable of doing it. But far be it from us to say that American institutions cannot make a fair citizen of an Indian, or that our divine system of religion cannot bring Christians out of wigwams. The word of Isaiah should be heeded by some workmen discouraged in Indian civilization: "Look unto the rock whence ye are hewn, and to the hole of the pit whence ye are digged." Men of English blood should not be disheartened over the very low grade of our aborigines. The rather they should read such authors as Sharon Turner and Lingard on the Anglo-Saxon, to see from what miserable stuff of Adam and humanity the English and American nations of to-day have been developed. Before the Revolution, and not long before, this entry was made in one of the records of Plymouth County, in Massachusetts, by one of her most learned citizens, and a justice of the peace:—

"Jenauary y^e 14 day 1742 biniamin tupper came to my hous to ceep Scool." There was then no public school system, and this Benjamin Tupper went from house to house and taught reading, writing, and spelling in the due proportion of each family, with board at forty cents a week. With such low beginnings, whose evidence is on the record of Squire Fearing, who would dare hope for the grand school system and eminent popular scholarship of which that county may well be proud to-day?

Something remains to be said of what the government is doing at Carlisle and Hampton. Since 1879, three hundred and forty-nine Indian boys and girls have been sent out from Hampton, educated after their manner. Generally favorable reports have come back from them, and they have accomplished as much civil-

izing and educating work as could be expected of them, or their circumstances would permit. They have withstood the trials of a surrounding uncivilization much better than many give them credit for. Lapses to blanket life and low wilderness living have been rare. When they have been able to find work and put in practice their school education, they have made a fair success.

What impresses us at first view, with reference to the government schools, is their total inadequacy to meet the demands of the Indian problem before the government. Of the 245,000 aborigines in our country, one fifth of them, or fifty thousand, may be reckoned as of school age. If it were possible, it is a great undertaking, and quite impracticable, to separate them from their homes and settle and support them in government institutions of learning. All success now achieved in this line we rejoice over, but cannot regard it as sample or first fruit of the harvest we covet. The theory of the future life of these educated Indians is impracticable. Says the Report of Carlisle for 1886: "The government is not attempting by means of its schools to prepare Indian youth to live in the midst of barbarism. Attempts in that direction have never been a success, and probably never will be. . . . The direction of all Indian educational work should be toward preparing Indians to live in civilization." In the same connection, the Report suggests that "every State have schools, and these schools be made introductory to civilized contact, and so in time all Indian children grow into a knowledge of and desire for American citizenship." So savagery is to be exhausted and extinguished by depriving the parents of their children, to be educated into a Christian civilization, and they never more to be seen by their parents!

Hence the singularly high standard for Indian education. It is proposed to follow the present two terms of five years each with a post-graduate course, "that all should go out into the schools of the land and measure themselves with their white brothers and sisters, thus making ready to compete with them for the prizes in life. . . . If the youth of the tribe are sent into our already organized public school systems, and from these encouraged to associate and to join in their interests with the nation at large, tribal socialisms, with all their perplexing clogs and expense to the government, will soon merge and disappear in the body politic of the country."

Thus in a generation or two, as the children are brought East to school, and their parents die off, the reservations will become

vacated, and what is now Indian country will be peopled by white settlers. Gradually the races will be blended by this mixture of the young Indians, educated in our common schools, and the populace will show all shadings from red to white by intermarriage, as to an extent now beyond the Mississippi. Every one will judge for himself of the probability or possibility of this solution of the Indian problem.

Much that is practical is learned at these two government schools, but how this knowledge is to be turned to account by these young Indians when they leave school is evidently a perplexing question. A return to the reservations is to an enforced idleness, since there is little call on them for employment in their trades and chosen callings, studied at Hampton and Carlisle. It is well urged that to settle down to life work on the reservations will consolidate and perpetuate tribal relations and the perpetuity of clans, which it is the wise policy of the government to change into holdings in severalty and homes, as in the agricultural and mechanical communities of white men. Here they will advance by the slow laws of civilization — never much to be hurried as in mechanical affairs — into citizenship and the common privileges and comforts of the poorer classes in the nineteenth century. If it comes to this, as apparently the government intends it shall, the present system of education in these schools may show a deficiency. The aims and grades may prove to have been too high and too ambitious. The pupils cannot do the mental work which the pupils can do in the tenth generation of the children from the Jamestown and Plymouth colonists. The laws of heredity must be recognized and have play, or nature will veto success. An ardent philanthropy must go at a slow pace, and not outrun nature. It is generally agreed, by outside observers about our mission, intellectual, and mechanical schools for the Indians, that we have marked too high for their attainments. Eliot had missed in judgment and aim when he led his Natick pupils and communicants to discuss the questions: "When Christ arose, whence came his soul?" "Our little children have not sinned: when they die, whither do they go?" "When such die as never heard of Christ, where do they go?" "Why did not God give all men good hearts?" "Since God is all-powerful, why did not God kill the Devil, that made men so bad?" Andover and the Supreme Court are still struggling over such questions. More sensible was the Scotch Society which sent over the Rev. John Brainard to teach the Indians secular and religious truths, and introduced

"spinning schools" in Pennsylvania, and unfolded the mysteries of preparing flax. The first generation may not be expected to get much beyond the plough, foreplane, anvil, cooking-stoves, and sewing-needles.

We would not pass an absolute judgment on the policy of bringing these Indian children East for literary instruction, and an induction into the principles and practices of American civilization. Yet we cannot but regret the waste force expended at Carlisle and Hampton. The several branches of labor, religious, literary, mechanical, and agricultural, at Hampton, are expended on 120 Indians at an annual cost of about \$20,000, not reckoning in the interest on about \$500,000 joint outlay and foundation for Indians and negroes. The power of the institution for the Indians for the time being does not go beyond these 120. The influences radiating far and wide from a school, academy, or college, as in one of the States, is lost beyond the area and limit of the 120. It can be seen, on reflection, how different it would be if the funds and the teachers were subdivided, and the schools were located centrally among the parents and families of the boys and girls, who would mingle with their friends daily or frequently. What was done at the school would be looked upon from a wide region, and its teachings would thus be disseminated indefinitely, and be constantly and practically discussed in the wigwams and around the camp-fires. New ideas and modes of living would break in over that eternal sameness of Indian existence. Any changes wrought in the children or in their habits of life would be observed. The mystery of tools and the conveniences they would introduce into their families would be opened up with surprise, and with some imitations and adoptions. The theoretic, with its formulas and emblems, would be exchanged for a practical application among the tepees and rude shelters of old homes. The parents would have a living illustration of clean and decently clad boys and girls. The reformation, elevation, and civilization of a tribe would begin and be obvious with the first day of the school. Of course there would be hindrances, difficulties, and some impossibilities, as in Massachusetts, from the dim outlines, and hard struggles to establish the district system, and all the way through the grades of the grammar and high to the normal school. Every pappoose will not be insured to become a baby saint, in scholarship, morals, and citizenship, by playing in sight of the Indian school, but all this will be made more possible and hopeful for him.

But the wide power and unconscious influence over the region of a literary institution living, working, and growing in it, needs not to be unfolded to further details. All this, be it more or less, with many admitted drawbacks, is lost to the Indian masses when it is pent up two thousand miles away.

Moreover, the perils and anxieties of the return of the pupils are obviated by this. The critical period, as is well known, is when the pupil, educated, elevated, and nobly ambitious, returns to the wigwam. The new contrast between the two parties is bold, and often quite to mutual repulsion. Under the change suggested they would have grown unconsciously and mutually into the new relation, and the tribe is already far advanced on the upward grade. True, the Carlisle theory implies that its graduates will not return to the reservation. "Why should they be remanded to such trial and failure?" "The government is not attempting by means of its schools to prepare Indian youth to live in the midst of barbarism. Attempts in that direction have never been a success, and probably never will be. The direction of all Indian educational work should be toward preparing Indians to live in civilization."¹

But this is an impossible theory when the Indian population is 250,000, those of school age 50,000, and all to be removed for education and unreturnable. Nor, according to the Report of 1881, is this separate schooling system very hopeful. This theory of Hampton and Carlisle contemplates the removal of all the children from Indian life and surroundings to new homes and the elevated civilization of the whites, never to return to the surroundings of Indian life. This theory of Indian education and elevation is totally impracticable, if not chimerical.

The remark of Indian Commissioner Kalb, of 1874, would seem, therefore, to be still in full force: "The true, permanent scheme for the management and instruction of the whole body of Indians within the control of the government is yet to be created."²

William Barrows.

¹ Report for 1886.

² *The Indian Question*, 1874, p. 99.

RECENT PROGRESS IN BALLOT REFORM.

WHEN the first ballot reform act was passed by the legislature of Victoria, in 1856, no one could have foreseen the rapid stride of the plan to remove, so far as possible, corruption from the vicinity of the polls. The agitation of the question in Australia had extended over several years previous to the enactment of the law. William Nicholson, the man to whom credit is due for having the act passed, was the hero of the day. He went to England in 1857, and preached the gospel of ballot reform. The agitation prevailed in several of the Australian provinces simultaneously. The real father of the system was Francis Dutton, a member of the South Australian legislature, who, after several years of unremitting agitation, had it adopted in South Australia in 1858. New South Wales and other Australian states rapidly followed. England herself, after a long struggle against the Anglo-Saxon's dislike both of change and of secrecy, adopted it in 1872,—at first tentatively, then more and more completely, till now it governs all elections in England and Wales, and practically in Scotland and Ireland also. Canada has joined the ranks, as have Belgium and Luxemburg; and some features of the system are employed in France, Italy, Hungary, Greece, and Austria.

The system has never been abandoned when once tried. In Australia whatever opposition existed has wholly ceased. Both parties in England refuse to abandon it, and yet it sometimes causes strange surprises. In some districts in England, in which it is impossible to hold a Conservative meeting without Radical interference, the Conservative candidates are returned by large majorities. The voters shout themselves hoarse at the Radical meetings; but when the day of the election comes they go to the polls and (unknown to the Radical leaders) vote for the Conservative candidates. Rather than be ostracized and maltreated by their comrades, the workingmen join hands with the Radicals before election, but vote as they choose at the polling booths. This illustrates the way in which the system has caused many surprises in every country; and, at the same time, it shows how useless it is for politicians to attempt to calculate beforehand whether or not the measure will benefit their particular party.

The system was first tried in the United States in Connecticut and Montana, in the October elections of 1889. Montana was

then a Territory, but it was admitted as a State on the 8th of the following November. The success of the plan in the October elections was still more marked at the elections held in those two States in November, when they were also joined by the States of Massachusetts and Rhode Island. In Montana the ballots are printed at the public expense, — that being the title of the act. What is known as the blanket ballot, or one ballot containing the names of all the candidates, is used; and the voter marks a cross opposite each name to be voted for, or at the head of a group of party candidates. A polling booth is allowed for every fifty voters, or a fraction thereof; and the voter shall not remain in the booth longer than five minutes, if the other booths are occupied. Political workers are not allowed to come within twenty-five feet of the polling places.

The law of Connecticut is a very short one. It provides for the use of official envelopes, which may not be marked for identification in any way. The voter can obtain at the booth "ballots of any political party he may desire;" but they must be printed on official paper, and the envelopes must be indorsed by the officials. Three minutes is the limit allowed in a booth, and workers are not allowed within one hundred feet of the polls. The State does not print the ballots, but they are provided by those most directly interested. Although Connecticut led all the other States of New England in adopting the secret ballot, yet even this measure, crude as it is, and hardly up to the standard of the Australian system, had a rough road in its passage through the legislature: the governor vetoed one of the bills, and it was only after a compromise that the final bill became a law.

In the adoption of the genuine Australian plan, Massachusetts was the pioneer of all the States. Upon the blanket ballot the names of candidates for each office were arranged under the designation of the office in alphabetical order, according to surnames. There were left at the end of the list of candidates for each different office as many blank spaces as there were persons to be elected to such office, in which the voter could insert the name of any person, not printed on the ballot, for whom he desired to vote. The ballots were so printed as to give to each voter a clear opportunity to designate by a cross, in a sufficient margin at the right of the name of each candidate, his choice of candidates and his answer to the questions submitted; and on the ballot might be printed such words as would aid the voter to do this, as "Vote for One," "Vote for Three," "Yes," "No," and

the like. No voter was allowed to keep a booth more than ten minutes, nor more than five minutes in case the other booths were in use. Voters who were not able to read and write were allowed assistance. The law did not prevent party workers from following the voters to and from the polling place and pressing them with solicitations; but this defect has been removed, and several amendments have been made which tend to make the law work more smoothly in the future. Rhode Island, the fourth member of the group of pioneer States in 1889, made provisions similar to those in the law of Massachusetts. The law of Rhode Island, however, is much more brief than that of Massachusetts. Five minutes is the extreme limit allowed for the voter to occupy a booth. Following the original law of Massachusetts, Rhode Island also made no restrictions upon workers at the polls.

So great was the success of ballot reform in 1889 that nine new States adopted the plan in 1890. These were Indiana, Maryland, Minnesota, Missouri, New Jersey, New York, Tennessee, Washington, and Wisconsin, or an aggregate of thirteen States in all which voted under the system only one year after it was first tried in the United States. The law of Indiana adopts the blanket ballot, and requires the voter to mark a cross beside each name, or at the head of a group of party candidates. The mark is made, not with a pencil, but with a stamp. If the certificate of nomination of any state convention shall request that the figure or device selected by such convention be used to designate the candidates of such party on the ballots for all elections throughout the State, such figure or device shall be so used until changed by request of a subsequent state convention of the same party. Such device may be the figure of a star, an eagle, a plough, or some such appropriate symbol; but the coat-of-arms or seal of the State or of the United States, the national flag, or any other emblem common to the people at large, shall not be used as such device. If any elector shall show his ballot to any other person after he has marked it, such ballot shall not be deposited in the ballot-box. No one is allowed within fifty feet of the polling places. Maryland also provided a stamp for marking individual names or a group at the head of a ticket nominated by any political party. An unsuccessful attempt was made to provide that an unofficial ballot, printed on paper of a different color from the official ballot, may be taken into the polling room by the voter, marked in advance, to assist him in marking the official ballot. This amendment was copied from the bill then pending in the legislature of New York.

Minnesota voted under a strict law requiring blanket ballots, and forbidding the use of any other kind. A cross designated the candidates to be voted for, which might be placed opposite each name, or at the head of a group of party candidates; but no restriction was made as to the time for occupying a booth. Missouri furnished a blanket-ballot law, with the provision that the voter should strike out all the names for which he did not wish to vote. The law required a blanket ballot.

The law of New York had the distinguishing feature of allowing a paster ballot, which any one could bring in his pocket and place over whatever official tickets were offered to him. This was the worst of several features in the very crude law which was first tried at the November election in 1890. As the law for New York was only enacted after several vetoes by the governor, and as it has attracted universal attention, the amendments made in 1891, under which the coming election will be held, are worthy of treatment at greater length.

The new law makes it more difficult hereafter to make independent nominations. The number of signers required to a certificate placing in nomination an independent candidate for a state office is increased from one thousand to three thousand; for a division less than the State but greater than a county, or for a county or a city, the number is increased from two hundred and fifty to five hundred. For an Assembly district the number of signers must be two hundred and fifty instead of one hundred, and the same provision is made for school commissioner districts, which were omitted entirely last year. When the nomination is for an office to be filled by voters in the city and county of New York, or the county of Kings, or the city of Brooklyn, six hundred signatures will be required instead of three hundred, and for parts of said cities and counties two hundred and fifty instead of one hundred. The following clause is also added, to prevent confusion of names: "The signers of a certificate made according to the provisions of this section shall not designate as the political or other name selected by them the name of any organized political party, without using in connection therewith some other word or words to distinguish the name selected by them from such party name; nor shall they use any word or designation indicating that such name is that of any regular party or political organization."

The county clerks are directed to publish at least six days before election the list of nominations "twice" in each daily news-

paper selected by them, instead of "daily." If there be no daily newspaper in the county, one publication only shall be made in each weekly newspaper. The section relating to the submission of constitutional amendments is considerably amplified by giving more explicit directions regarding the procedure. If any such amendment or proposition is to be submitted at a special election, notices of it must be given the same as at a general election; as many ballot-boxes to be provided as there are amendments to be voted upon; official ballots to be printed at the expense of counties and municipalities, whose officers are required to furnish them; and the votes to be canvassed by the county canvassers at the same time with the votes of the next succeeding general election.

The amendments relating to official ballots are evidently also intended to make the canvass of the independent candidate more difficult than under the original act. Provision was at first made that no names should be placed upon an independent ticket, except the names specified in the certificate of nomination, without the approval of the persons designated and appointed in said certificate, such approval to be made at least twelve days before election. The amendment applies this also to the person whose name is used by providing that the name of a person nominated in the regular way shall not be placed on an independent ticket "when such person shall have given notice at least fifteen days before election, to the officer with whom his original certificate of nomination was filed, by a writing signed and duly acknowledged, that he does not wish his name placed upon such a ticket." Independent certificates, another section of the law provides, must be filed for state offices, and offices in districts larger than a county, with the secretary of state, not less than fifteen days before election; and for local offices, with the county clerk, not less than twelve days before election. As a regular candidate can forbid the use of his name up to within fifteen days before election, it will be somewhat difficult to fill out independent tickets with regular nominations hereafter. Another amendment provides that independent candidates shall not require their names to be printed on more than one kind of ballot. It will be remembered that at this year's charter election some independent candidates had two and even three tickets in the field. The disputed question of how to fold ballots is settled at last by an amendment providing that they may be folded "crosswise by bringing the bottom of the ballot up to the perforated line, and then in the middle lengthwise."

Another change provides that the county clerk, or other officer charged with the duty of printing ballots, is directed to print but one hundred instead of two hundred ballots for every fifty voters, or fraction of fifty voters, in a district. Twelve sample ballots must also be provided for each election district, of the same form and size as the official ballots, but printed on paper of a different color and without the stub numbers. A record of the number of ballots furnished must also be kept and preserved for one year. And it is further provided that divisions or alterations of election districts must be made on or before August 1st, instead of September 1st, and that each election district shall contain not more than four hundred voters instead of three hundred. Not more than one polling place can hereafter be in the same room. The clause requiring the ballot clerks, or a ballot clerk and an inspector, to write their initials on the stub of each of the ballots is repealed. In its place, the amendment gives the ballot clerks the right to instruct the voter how to fold his ballot, and to illustrate by folding the sample ballots in his presence. A most important amendment is the one providing that the inspectors shall not receive a ballot from a voter unless each ballot presented to him shall, when delivered to them, be folded so that the inside is concealed and the indorsement and number visible. The provision that no person shall occupy one booth less than three minutes is stricken out. The ten-minute limit remains, however.

It is provided that the statement of the disposition made of the ballots required to be made out by the inspectors is to be filed with the county clerk or other officer in charge of the printing of the ballots. The sealed package containing the unused and spoiled ballots is also to be taken to such officer, and after the official canvass must be burned. The section relating to the canvass of the vote by the inspectors is amended so that, in case a ballot or paster appears to be marked for identification, it shall be attached to the certificate of canvass with a statement embodying the grounds on which the validity of such ballot is questioned. The county canvassers shall also canvass them separately. Such ballots shall be counted in estimating the result, but the canvass may be reviewed by mandamus proceedings. All such ballots shall be preserved for at least one year, or until the questions raised have been settled. The marking of a ballot for identification by an election officer is made a misdemeanor, punishable, as are the other offenses enumerated in the section, by imprisonment in the county jail for not less than six months nor more than one year.

No voter can mark his ballot, or do any act with the intent that it may be identified as the one cast by him. The same provision is made regarding a paster ballot, and it is provided that such ballots so marked for identification shall be void and of no effect.

By one of the new sections referring to town and village officers, and excluding them from some of the provisions of the general act, it is provided that nominations may be made in the regular way by representatives of parties which polled one per cent. of the vote at the last preceding fall election. Some changes are made regarding the form of town ballots. Excise commissioners are hereafter to be voted for on separate ballots. The number of booths to be provided for at such elections shall be one for every fifty votes polled at the last preceding village or town election. Ballot clerks shall not serve at town or village elections.

This form of the bill was not satisfactory to those who had at heart the best interests of ballot reform. Their attempt to secure the blanket ballot, instead of the paster ballot, did not succeed; but rather than to have no amendments at all to what was certainly a crude law—that of 1890—they accepted this bill. After it had reached the governor, a number of protests were made, more particularly against limiting independent candidates to one ballot, and the amendment authorizing candidates of the regular parties to file caveats forbidding the printing of their names on the ballots of independent candidates. But the bill became a law with these provisions. The good provisions of the law of 1890 are retained, forbidding the presence of workers within one hundred feet of the polls, and throwing more than the ordinary safeguards around the custody of ballots that have been spoiled; but the bad provision, requiring ballot clerks to place their initials on the ballots, still remains.

The ballot reform law enacted by New Jersey, and used for the first time in 1890, did not provide for a blanket ballot, but allowed each political party a paster ballot, after the manner of the law in New York. The law also allowed the official ballots, printed and distributed at the public expense, to be obtained five days in advance of the election by any one who might apply for them. This gave the politicians the power to place tickets in the hands of their followers outside of the polling places; and it was a very undesirable feature, although the politicians are not allowed to follow the voters within one hundred feet of the polling places. As in Connecticut, official envelopes are used, which can be obtained only at the polling places and on election day. The fact is,

that the ballot reform laws in Connecticut, New York, and New Jersey were passed, and in the case of New York amended, by the enemies of the full and complete Australian system.

The law in Tennessee was modeled somewhat upon that of New Jersey; but a blanket ballot is used, upon which the voter must cross the names to be voted for. The law of Washington gives the blanket ballot, which must be marked with a cross at the head of the party group, in a way similar to that adopted by Massachusetts. Wisconsin has followed Washington and Massachusetts in these respects; but the voter is allowed to remain ten minutes in the booth in case the other booths are not occupied.

We have thus seen that, down to 1891, thirteen States had adopted the Australian system of voting, although some of them had made such wide deviations from the original law that they could hardly be named in the list. In November of the present year, thirteen more States will be added to the list, making twenty-six in all which will use the Australian system at the coming election. The thirteen States which will try the law for the first time in 1891 are Arkansas, California, Delaware, Illinois, Michigan, Nebraska, New Hampshire, Ohio, Oregon, Pennsylvania, Vermont, West Virginia, and Wyoming. The latter State adopted the system while it was still a Territory; but as it has recently been admitted into the Union it will hold its first election under this system as a State, in November.

Arkansas has all the general features of the Australian ballot system. The blanket ballot is used, but the voter erases all names for which he does not wish to vote. Delaware has a modified Australian system of voting, something like the one followed by New York. The cross is stamped, and not marked. Workers are allowed within thirty feet of the polls. The law of Massachusetts has been adopted by Illinois with only slight variations. More latitude is allowed, however, in regard to the marking of ballots. By some accident, that provision in the bill which was intended to protect voters from the importunities of "workers" in the immediate vicinity of the polls was omitted when the bill became a law. New Hampshire and California also follow the law of Massachusetts as to the blanket ballot, and in every other important respect.

A radically different law is now in force in Pennsylvania. While the blanket ballot is required, and while the voter must mark his candidates with an X, yet there are some peculiar features that are worthy of mention. Workers can approach close

to the polls, but no person within the voting-room is allowed to electioneer for any candidate. A voter declaring his disability may have the assistance of any voter he wishes in the booth. The law of Vermont, which took effect January 1, 1891, is in all essential respects similar to the Massachusetts and Rhode Island laws, and the other most desirable laws thus far enacted. It provides for the single blanket ballot. The voters are to indicate their choice by making an X after the names of the candidates for whom they wish to vote. There is no provision forbidding electioneering within the immediate vicinity of the polling places, but it is forbidden to interfere with or endeavor to induce any voter to vote for any particular candidate inside the polling place.

The law of Michigan is *sui generis*. Like the law of Connecticut, it requires that all ballots shall be uniform in size and appearance, with no distinguishing mark upon the outside. Each party can, however, have a vignette or device of its own choosing placed at the head of its list of candidates upon the face of the ballot. Ballots are furnished in advance of the election. They are distributed, as in Connecticut and New Jersey, in and out of the polling places on election day. Spoiled ballots are destroyed. Workers are allowed within one hundred feet of the polls.

Nebraska enacted an Australian ballot law in March, 1891. The several candidates for each office are named alphabetically, together with the political party each represents, under a caption stating that office. The direction "Vote for One," is also given; and the voter does this by marking an X in ink opposite the name of the candidate of his choice. Illiterate voters may be assisted by one or two of the election officers. Workers can approach no nearer to the polls than twelve feet.

Ohio has the blanket ballot, with the names of the candidates of each party arranged in vertical columns, and not across the ballot as in the case of Nebraska. Each column is headed with the name of the party, and a pictorial device to assist the illiterate voter. The Republican ticket has an eagle; the Democratic, a rooster; the Prohibition, a rose; and the People's, a plough. The voter marks an X before the name of the party for whose candidates he wishes to vote; but if he marks thus, and also marks individual candidates of another party, the latter will be counted, together with those of his own party not affected by his independent marks,—the intent of the voter being carefully studied. Any voter desiring assistance can have it from two judges of election belonging to different political parties.

The new law of Oregon provides for official ballots to be printed by the State. The names are arranged, as in Nebraska, all candidates for an office being grouped under a heading stating that office. Voters erase all names for which they do not wish to vote. Assistance may be given by two of the judges. Workers can approach to within six feet of the ballot-boxes and ten feet of the polling booths.

West Virginia qualifies its ballot law of 1891 with these words: "The voter shall be left free to vote by either open, sealed, or secret ballot, as he may elect, otherwise the mode and manner of voting shall be as herein prescribed." Then follow provisions requiring a non-partisan Board of Ballot Commissioners in each county to provide printed ballots on which the names of the candidates of each party are printed in columns, under the name of the party, as is the case in Ohio. The voter shall strike out, with ink, the party tickets or the individual candidates for which he does not wish to vote. The poll clerks may assist the illiterate voter by preparing such a ballot as he wishes to vote. Outsiders are not allowed to come within sixty feet of the ballot-boxes or the booths.

To recapitulate: we find that twenty-six of the States of the Union will vote under some form of the Australian system in November, 1891. This leaves only eighteen States which have not made a great advance in the reform within the past three years. The eighteen are: Alabama, Colorado, Florida, Georgia, Idaho, Iowa, Kansas, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maine, Mississippi, Nevada, North Carolina, North Dakota, South Carolina, South Dakota, Texas, and Virginia. Progress, however, has been made in Iowa, although ballot reform laws were defeated in that State in 1891. The new constitution just adopted by Kentucky provides that all elections by the people shall be by secret official ballot, furnished by public authority to the voters at the polls, and marked by each voter in private at the polls, and then and there deposited. The General Assembly is given power to make the necessary laws for carrying this provision into effect, and it will probably do so next winter. Maine, it should be stated, has enacted the full Australian ballot, similar to the law of Massachusetts; but the first election under its provisions will not take place till September, 1892.

Thus we observe that nearly two thirds of the States of the Union have now the Australian ballot, although in four or five of them the laws are not as complete a copy as they might be; and

that three other States will probably have this form of ballot within the coming year. The outlook is, that the reform cannot long be delayed in the fifteen States that have, thus far, made no move toward its adoption.

Frederic G. Mather.

ALBANY, N. Y.

CONSERVATIVE APOLOGETICS.

CAN Apologetics be anything but conservative — of faith? Certainly. It may try to save the old arguments; that is, it is capable of being antiquated. I am afraid the idea of such an office is ridiculous. As though one at this late day should object to rifles because he carried a smooth-bore at Gettysburg; or to smokeless powder because he likes to hide his argument in a cloud; or as though young Swift, running to warn people of some Johnstown flood, were besought by old Slowfoot not to run him out of breath. But Swift is not racing a deluge in order to keep Slowfoot in company, hard as it is for poor old Slowfoot to see how this can be. Yet I have often thought that the best service one can do his neighbors, under this "government of the people, by the people" and their notions, is to let himself appear a little absurd. It does n't hurt so much worse than a drubbing, as any one may know who will calmly submit to being thought behind the times.

And so, while I am not going to say over again that Dr. Paley meant well, and has only to be translated into modern technicalities to show himself a sound thinker, I attempt a more audacious task: to set over against two most admired phases of modern apologetics two of the least admired, because I think the old two are better.

That notion of the most enlightened apologists which wins heartiest assent from the most enlightened readers is that we can best make out the existence of God by identifying him as the Indweller who is at bottom of everything that gets itself done in the universe, and who, because he is Spirit, is force, cause, order, purpose. The Divine Immanence is the phrase to swear by, to solve all the cosmic mysteries with, or that promises to do this on the sole condition that you just sit and gaze at them through it. Nearly all the modern respectabilities have tried the method and report that it works. They have even attempted to tell what

they saw; but one needs to get used to looking through this phrase before he can see what others' eyes see by its weird help.

There is no doubt, though, about the merit of those who offer to explain things by Spirit. If our day, to quote familiar instances, boasts any James Martineau, convincing as he is acute, and high-souled as a major prophet; if we have any gracious John Fiske, whose "Idea of God" or "Destiny of Man" it is a kind of discourtesy to dispute; if any Francis Abbot, who has stuck unbelieving nominalism as full of refutations as a St. Sebastian is of arrows, or a pin-cushion of pins; if any Jacob Schurman, type of the accomplished young professor, whose statements are modest as science, and as assured, — these, one and all, inevitably tell us that matter is eternal, and force is God. And how reverent and how rich their thought is! Yes, and how bald and irrational they make the opposite idea appear! If that immanence which constitutes all efficiency divine is not the real immanence, what chance is there for any other sort? Is it *con-cursus*? Is natural force natural, and God merely its conserver? Why, if it comes to that, a force which *exists* needs no conserver; physics, with its law of conservation, will look after that. If physics, then, will assent to this, that the Eternal, the Self-existent, is himself the protean-convertible, spiritual essence of all efficiency in the world, we ought to be thankful that the physicist says it, for that settles things in these days against all gain-saying; that is to say, until one finds that the physicists, like the Plymouth Brethren, have each and all their several inspirations to interpret the Nature-Bible in infallible, but, alas! contradictory senses.

It is "deistic," I know, and that is the end of all respect for any opinion in these days of profoundly religious and profoundly pantheistic conceptions; it is deistic, and, what is worse in a Calvinist, it is inconsistent, to demur to this thorough-going doctrine of divine immanence. I say it is inconsistent for a Calvinist; and I have the fear of Professor Allen before my eyes. Some one is bound to throw his "Continuity" at me. But pray let him tell whether it is not the Calvinist, the theologian who believes not only in individual election but in effectual calling, that ought to feel quite at his ease with the like control of Deity over material things. And is it not your anti-Augustinian, — not to put too fine a point on it, is it not your Arminian, your thorough stickler for the autonomy of human wills, — is it not he that ought to draw back from every hint that all efficiency in things is

God's own acting? Inconsistent as I confess that it is for a Calvinist to demur to the identification of God with force, deistic as it looks into the bargain, shameful as it has been accounted ever since Carlyle laughed his horse-laugh at the "absentee Deity" who looked on to "see the world go," — still a good many things stand in the way of accepting the ultra-religious view of nature. Of them all, these two: —

I do not see what particular reason there is for believing that the theory is true. It is stated over and again with the confidence of a self-evident truth; and I often mourn because I am too dull to catch the unexpressed reason for holding it true. I know that the reasons for self-evident truths cannot be stated, and that one's development is away down if he has not risen to the level of self-evident truths. But that is the plight this paper will once and again show that its writer is in. I own it; I cannot see why to acknowledge the mystery of force and to hold the immanence of God is all the same as saying that God does everything in nature.

The other objection is, that no one has ever yet made out the correlation of physical and mental energy. You cannot convert a blow, or a shock of electricity, or a touch of genial sunlight, into an idea. Nor can you convert a volition into a vibration of nerves or a contraction of muscles. Until this "great gulf fixed" between the realms of matter and mind is bridged by some cantilever contrivance run out from one shore or the other, let whoever will try to leap it: I do not dare; I seem now to be recognizably somewhere, *et j'y reste*.

Now, instead of that grand notion that God does everything because He is the life of everything that lives, and the motor of all that moves, I have the audacity to believe that He is the First Cause, in the bald, hard, hateful "deistic" sense. It comes in the end to this, that God is true cause; but, to begin with, let us discard all talk of cause, as metaphysics; and let us, never without fear of the physicist, who will have us take his theistic interpretation of things or none at all, — let us speak of what no one can deny in the name of science; to wit, matter and motion. I have already declined with thanks the idea that matter and motion squarely tell us of God. It is not very rash to allege that science cannot give us the Maker's name. But it can refuse to say anything against Him; and this sphinx of a world, when pressed hard for an answer, can deny every other conjecture about its source, and leave us shut up to this one, that motion, and

matter too, had an origin, absolutely an origin, in a being not yet known as God, which (or by courtesy who) is himself neither matter nor motion. The process of exclusion is a legitimate and a conclusive one, if it be quite clear that nothing is excluded which ought to stay, and no hypothesis ignorantly or deceitfully overlooked. In the present case, the process need not be a long one; always providing its steps are not neglected by my fellow-traveler merely because they are few and short. If he leaps them, he will have to go back and pick his way again, or else go his own road.

It is accepted for fact, is it not, that the existing state of things has come around as a sequent upon an indefinitely long process of changes, the general character of which has been progress from simplicity toward complexity. Let the word be allowed: the world is a product of Evolution. The word suggests a synthetic process, a progress; but we are constantly compelled to think backward, and analyze evolution. And so we find ourselves tracing the cosmic motions, through which the existing state of facts came about, back, back, back, — how far back? Is there any point short of original simplicity at which thought will or ought to pause? Complexity after simplicity means simplicity before complexity. If not, why not? But original simplicity, — if we may for a moment turn over an idea which is self-contradictory, — original simplicity, to which evolution forces us back, is a state of things before which there was no motion at all; for any motion would have been but a first step in the indefinitely long process which has issued in what is before our eyes. It is axiomatic, I believe, in physics, that bodies at rest do not spontaneously begin to move. Evolution, the undeniable process of the cosmos, forces us back, back, back still to a point when a Mover who was not the universe moved the universe. That would make him the Architect of materials which had existed from eternity.

But a state of original simplicity, antedated by no motion at all, is unthinkable. Absolute simplicity is a denial of every quality that can be thought of, unless mere existence be a quality. But existence, too, must be denied] to matter in a state of simplicity. Always with the fear of the physicist before my eyes, — of the physicist who will hear to no one's speculation unless it is his own, — frightened as I am to say it, it nevertheless seems plain to my dullness that motion is essential to essential properties of matter. For instance, unless there was a date before

which there was neither the "stress" of particles toward each other which we call attraction, nor the stress of particles away from each other which we call repulsion, and which offers itself to sensation under the guise of heat, — unless before that fancied date molecules were neither pushed nor pulled either toward or from each other, then there never was a date before which extension and density, the properties external and internal which are indispensable to the existence of matter in mass, were not due to motion. Until one has reason to affirm that mass may exist without any attraction or repulsion to give it the dimensions it has, — until then it is safe to say that motion is essential to the existence of matter. Why, then, it follows that if God were Architect, He was also out-and-out Creator. It follows that, if original simplicity is original impossibility, then a being not the universe brought the universe forth, and made it with properties, made it something this side of absolutely simple.

There is another way of looking at the same case. Every measurable change requires measurable time. Every definite state of things permits only a corresponding duration of the process which brought that state of things about. Geologists assume this, and try to measure for us the periods which the earth demands. Whether they measure accurately or not, it is certain that the process which has led up to the present condition of the globe must be regarded as measurable. It is not more certain that a tree or a man just fifty years old cannot possibly have lived a day longer, than that the world cannot have been "going on" any longer than the time indicated by the results before our eyes. If the process had been going on from eternity, this present stage in it ought to have existed indefinitely in the past. Eternity furnished time enough. And any state of things as far in the future as the world shall last ought to be present to-day, that is, if the world has reached its existing state by a process of changes from eternity. In other words, there is no right time in all eternity for any definite state of things. Every moment in all eternity is the wrong moment for that which now is. Or, in yet other words, the notion of the production of a definite state of things by an eternal series of changes is self-contradictory.

It does not help matters to put the theory of cycles in the place of the theory of an eternal series of progressive changes. It is all one whether we say that eternal progress is the law, or that limited progress, followed by destruction, is the law. This set of changes called a cycle is as definite, that is as limited, a thing as

any single phenomenon, and equally involves some proportion between stages of the process and the time required to effect them.

But the suggestion of cycles brings to view another objection to the eternal preëxistence of matter and change, namely, the incessant and enormous dissipation of energy which attends the history of any or all the orbs of heaven. Let us say that the end of this cycle is a collapse of a system, say the solar system. Its collapse, if so untechnical a term is allowable for the ultimate fall of the planets into the sun, the catastrophe of the present cycle, would be the beginning of a new cycle. But after the incalculable loss of heat which has taken place during the course of the extant cycle, how much smaller the size of the nebula with which the next cycle will begin, and how much shorter its history! Briefer still that of the next, and of the next, until it seems certain as anything involved in so tremendous a theory can be, that after "a time, times, and half a time" the material of our system will be dead as the moon, because its energy is exhausted. But if the system had been one of a series from eternity, its energy in the past must have been infinite; and if infinite, it could never be exhausted. It would seem that, once more, the notion of a series from eternity is self-contradictory. Not the less so when we reflect that a cycle which existed an eternity ago must have had at command an infinite store of energy, and that in such a case not all its energy could ever be dissipated. In other words, that eternally ancient cycle could have no successor, would be the present cycle, that is, no cycle at all; so that the theory of cycles resolves into the theory of one long progress from eternity.

Little as I can pretend to know about these matters, I know some have imagined that the energy of the known physical universe is not lost to it, because they suppose the ether to be limited, so that the flying energy gets turned back into the interstellar spaces which we know about, and is focused somewhere. But if any one can give a reason for supposing that the hypothetical ether which conveys light and heat from orb to orb has any limits, what is that reason? Or, if any one knows a reason to believe that somewhere in the spaces about us there is a focus in which is gathered all the heat ever radiated from all the suns, or that it is focused in a good many such points-no-point, where is that terrific furnace? or what is the reason it gives no sign, if it is anywhere?

It would seem that there is a Creator, of whom we are shut up to saying that, whatever He (or It) is, He is not the universe, not

the substance of it, nor the energy of it, but just the originator of it; and that if He be its conserver, this must be learned in some other way than from any known need which nature has for support.

Now the argument I have withstood is not novel, but it has the support of the men who teach the new age. Neither is the next position which I must antagonize novel; but it, too, is a favorite apologetic in our day, and, like the one already contested, it sets aside some ancient arguments of greater worth, according to my foolhardy opinion.

This other lofty argument for the existence of God is, that no argument is needed, nor indeed worth much, because his existence is a first truth, a rational intuition, a logical *prius* of all other knowledge. Thus God, it is said by many of our standard thinkers, may be intuited as infinite Being correlative to finite; as absolute Being correlative to dependent; as creative Reason guaranteeing the veracity of human reason; as holy Lawgiver, recognized in the very idea of law. It is another of those cases in which to raise an objection is a shame to the objector. He as good as disclaims insight into the spiritual things which our apostles say they can see and are willing to talk of among "the perfect." But my eyes are dull, at all events so myopic that objections are all I see whenever I look for the self-evident existence of God.

I cannot see how a first truth, a self-evident reality, can be capable of analysis, or of demonstration by any logically prior idea. Now the idea of God is highly complex, at all events. It can be resolved into its elements; these elements can be singly tested; if they bear the test, they can be synthetized; and, when harmoniously synthetized, they must be shown to stand for a Being that exists. Unless this is a total misconception, then the idea of God may perhaps be inferred from intuitions, but certainly is not itself intuited.

Suppose two ideas so correlated that the conception of either one logically necessitates that of the other; neither, then, has logical priority. The one first in the mind is the one from which the other is logically deduced. So far forth, then, as the idea of God is a logical correlate of other ideas already in the mind, I think we must say that it is logically dependent on the ideas to which it is temporally sequent.

Again, knowledge of an object may involve the idea, without involving the existence, of another object. That the second

really exists can be inferred from the first only when the first is known to be in its very nature inseparable from the second. For example: knowledge of an object limited in extension logically involves the idea, but not the occupancy, of unlimited extension. On the other hand, an object limited in duration certifies the existence of some being, unlimited in duration, to which its own existence is due; but does it not remain to be proved that the universe is not itself the eternal, self-existent, absolute Being? Of course, after insisting upon the old cosmological argument, I believe nothing of the sort; but I believe the universe had its creator, because this can be proved, not because it is self-evident.

Again, knowledge of the divine existence rests upon the very ideas which it is said to support. For example: the trustworthiness of human logic is already taken for granted when it is argued that its trustworthiness requires the existence of creative Reason as its guarantee; otherwise, how do we know that we are right in our argument so far? Or, if it be replied that the existence of God is a first truth, not a fact assured by argument, then the competence of the human reason to recognize one first truth intuitively is assumed; but if one, why only this one? Or, when we are bidden to notice that the very words "right" and "duty" are meaningless without a supreme Lawgiver whose nature is the standard of right, and whose requirements are the rule of duty, I cannot help asking, if the idea of right and duty is not intrinsically valid, whether it can be known that right is real in the case of God, or duty an actuality when imposed by his will. We may be indulging fancies when we ascribe moral quality to a Supreme Person, if we may be mistaken in ascribing it to subordinate persons.

In other words, unless somebody can show that the validity of human reason and the reality of moral difference are not primary beliefs and first truths, then to say that they require the idea of God as their logical *prius* is to say that a first truth must lie back of a first truth; but no one will say it. The knowledge of God's existence rests on intuitions, is not their support.

And here are some intuitions from which that existence may be inferred. The perspicacious reader may see clean through them to something they build upon; but I must at least give him the chance, for they seem primary to me. To wit: that there is a difference between right and wrong, and that right is something obligatory and wrong something inadmissible. Not, of course, that we know intuitively what the right thing is, nor that it is duty to do everything which is right; but that in any case the thing which is antithetic to wrong, whether the right be action or inac-

tion, is indisputably duty. For instance, again, there is an intuition of difference in the lovable and the unlovely; of unlikeness between the beautiful and the ugly, between the trustworthy and the untrustworthy. Not that love, æsthetic sensibility, or faith knows what its proper object is in every case; but that these faculties as surely imply the existence of their correlative as hunger implies the reality of food. Of course, it is experience which is the occasion of knowing what stands over against the yearning for food; and it is experience of how God satisfies the lofty faculties just instanced which alone makes plain what they want: but experience gave the faculty its opportunity of knowledge; it did not create the faculty, nor furnish the certainty of its cognition.

There is in this curious human recognition of moral and divine realities, which sense cannot furnish nor the mind doubt while they meet its wants, — there is here an explanation of the firmness with which monotheism holds its own when once implanted in the mind of a developed people. Christendom might be half persuaded that there is no God at all, but there would be no persuading it of many gods. Monotheism is the irresistible response of our higher faculties to the idea of perfection. Once conceived, this idea alone represents God. It is only an all-perfect Being that satisfies the wants of our moral, affectional, æsthetic, and pistic capacities (if a horrible adjective may be allowed); and so, when one hears that this or that perfection exists, he has to assign it to his perfect Deity. It is a felt breach in this normal process which makes the worship of any less than an all-perfect Being so revolting. And we refuse to believe in minor divinities, for these would divide the glories which are essential to God.

But I must not wander. Against the lordly claim that men can know they have a God without any proof for it, this humble tenet is more defensible: We know we need a God, and our need is the soul's physiological appetency which cannot be in grotesque contradiction to the physiological wants of the body; these are met, and that must be. It is a plodding way, the conservative way of apologetics. It will satisfy none that have found a path through "the trackless air." It is slow as well as lowly plodding here: but if one trips he can hardly catch so bad a fall; and if he keeps his footing he will reach the goal the angels look upon, and saintly men desecry, when they will, — the reality of the true God.

E. H. Johnson.

CROZER THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY, CHESTER, PA.

EDITORIAL.

THE NEW YORK PRESBYTERY AND PROFESSOR BRIGGS.

THE Presbytery of New York met on Monday, the 4th instant, and received the report of the committee appointed last May to prosecute Professor C. A. Briggs. Before the report was presented, one of its members offered a substitute for it in the form of the following resolution : —

"Whereas, the Presbytery of New York, at its meeting in May last, on account of utterances contained in an inaugural address, delivered January 20, 1891, appointed a committee to formulate charges against the author of that address, the Rev. Charles A. Briggs, D. D. ; and whereas, since that action was taken, the accused has supplemented these utterances by responding to certain categorical questions ; therefore

"Resolved, That the Presbytery, without pronouncing on the sufficiency of these later declarations to cover all the points concerning which the accused has been called in question, and with hearty appreciation of the faithful labors of our committee, deems it expedient to arrest judicial proceedings, and hereby discharges the committee from further consideration of the case."

Action upon this amendment was postponed until after the reading of the report of the prosecuting committee. Then it was debated, and, after an unsuccessful attempt to amend it by the insertion of a censure of Professor Briggs, was voted down, sixty-two members voting for it (of whom fifty were ministers) and sixty-four (of whom forty-four were ministers) voting against it.

The report of the committee was then adopted. We have printed this elsewhere, in the belief that our readers will be glad to have its full text.

We do not purpose discussing the justice of the charges preferred by the committee. We could not do so without repeating what we said in our number of last February about the essential harmony of the views expressed in the "Inaugural" with the evangelical conception of Christianity. Two of the assertions incidentally made by the committee seem to us deserving of comment. One is the claim that Professor Briggs deserves to be tried and punished for expressing opinions which a large part of the Presbyterian Church do not like : "The erroneous and ill-advised utterances of Dr. Briggs, in the Inaugural Address, have seriously disturbed the peace of the church, and led to a situation full of difficulty and complication. . . . Yet, for the reasons above given, we have determined not to include this grave offense against the peace of the church in the list of formal charges."

Professor Briggs cannot be supposed to have foreseen, when he delivered his Inaugural, the excitement it would cause. Nevertheless he is, according to the committee, ecclesiastically more blameworthy than he

would be if the address had been received with universal favor. Therefore one of the standards by which a Presbyterian minister must be tried is the popularity within the Presbyterian Church which his public utterances have. Again, in the first charge, it is said that "the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America charges the Rev. Charles A. Briggs . . . with teaching doctrines which conflict irreconcilably with, and are contrary to, the cardinal doctrine taught in the Holy Scriptures, and contained in the standards of the Presbyterian Church, — that the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments are the only infallible rule of faith and practice."

To call the doctrine which treats of Scripture the "cardinal doctrine" is equivalent to saying that a correct belief about the Bible is of more importance than a correct belief about God or Christ. Only a fraction of "the Presbyterian Church of the United States" would, we suspect, accept the opinion ascribed to it by the prosecuting committee, and alleged as a reason for the judicial action taken by the Presbytery on its behalf. These two utterances of the report suggest partisanship, and lessen the moral weight of the action of the majority in adopting it.

Professor Briggs and his friends have, we think, good reason to rejoice at the failure of the motion to dismiss his case. That motion did not imply approval of the "Inaugural," but was coupled with a subsequent expression of Dr. Briggs's theological views, the answers to "categorical questions" put to him in his sick-room last summer by several of the directors of Union Seminary. If the motion had passed, the party opposed to Dr. Briggs in the Presbytery would probably have claimed that, inasmuch as the trial had been abandoned because of this later expression of opinion, Dr. Briggs's future utterances should harmonize with a strict construction of it. To such a claim Dr. Briggs could not, of course, have consistently yielded, and yet it would have had enough of reasonableness to make refusal to submit to it to some extent injurious to his influence. Besides, the prosecution gives Professor Briggs the best possible opportunity of effectively addressing the Presbyterian Church. This he must desire above all things. He has undertaken to dislodge certain errors from the Presbyterian mind, counting the cost of the undertaking, doubtless, and hoping to carry it through. He has made a good beginning, but the larger part of the work is yet undone. He is doubtless bent on carrying it forward, and desires nothing so much as favorable circumstances for doing so. These are now given him. An immense audience is to be gathered to hear him. The antecedents of the trial, and the place in which it is held, make it certain that the reports of it will be read through the length and breadth of the land. The dramatic interest attaching to a trial will draw a more careful attention to Professor Briggs's defense than would be given to his books by any who are not close students of the Bible. And what he has to say for himself will be said in behalf of his doctrines. He is charged with

holding and inculcating ideas which are anti-Biblical and anti-Presbyterian, and he can only successfully defend himself by showing that his ideas are Biblical and Presbyterian.

Professor Briggs will have a great advantage in the attitude in which the prosecution places him. He speaks under compulsion. He is obliged to attack anew the errors which it is his mission to fight, and therefore the suspicion of arrogance and disputatiousness cannot attach to his words. Self-respect and respect for the ministry require him to use all the resources of his great learning in making the attack.

To be sure, the Presbyterian public, when listening to Professor Briggs, will remember that the *primâ facie* judgment of a majority of his Presbytery is against him. But the smallness of the majority, and the signs of party spirit shown by its representatives, will take from this fact much of its moral weight. Indeed, the unwillingness of the American mind to recognize ecclesiastical authority in regard to doctrine is so great, it may be doubted whether one defending his views before a closely divided church tribunal will not have from the beginning the sympathy of most of the audience.

The fact that the Presbyterian Church is now revising its standards cannot but add greatly to the effectiveness of Dr. Briggs's utterance. He will be able to say: The charges brought against me are framed upon the assumption that I am held to the letter of the Westminster Confession. For example, the article describing the Scriptures is so minutely interpreted as to make its assertions about the externalities of the sacred books a part of the creed of the church, and binding upon its ministry. Yet the Presbyterian Church of America has, by undertaking to revise its articles, said that they are not in all their details the standard of its belief. Dr. Briggs may adopt language lately used by A. Taylor Innes of Scotland, one of the foremost canonical writers and lawyers of the Presbyterian Church, about the proposition to try Professor Bruce and Professor Dods: when the Confession is under revision, the church cannot either constitutionally or honestly find a man guilty on a libel for merely deviating from its Confession; it cannot, whether the deviation be on one point or along the whole line. For the one point may be precisely the point which is to be revised out.

Showing that the action of the prosecutors is absurd will not, indeed, be equivalent to showing that the views of Professor Briggs are right. But it will be helpful in securing fair consideration to such arguments as are advanced for those views. The disputant in a public debate, who seems to the audience to have been unjustly treated by his antagonist, has an important advantage. Whatever, then, the immediate issue of the trial, it cannot but have immense influence in helping the Presbyterian Church to true views of the Bible; to discrimination between divine revelation and its record.

One may find help in realizing the aspect which this event will wear to

the next generation by reverting to one in many details its counterpart, — the trial of Albert Barnes. Charges were brought against Mr. Barnes before the Second Presbytery of Philadelphia, on the ground of doctrinal views expressed in the latter's commentary on the Romans. The charges were these : —

“ 1. Teaching that all sin consists in voluntary action.

2. That Adam (before and after his fall) was ignorant of his moral relations to such a degree that he did not know the consequences of his sin would or should reach any further than to his natural death.

3. That unregenerate men are able to keep the commandments and convert themselves to God.

4. That faith is an act of the mind, and not a principle, and is itself imputed for righteousness.

5. Denying that God entered into covenant with Adam, constituting him a federal or covenant head, and representative to all his natural descendants.

6. Denying that the first sin of Adam is imputed to his posterity.

7. Denying that mankind are guilty, that is, liable to punishment, on account of the sin of Adam.

8. Denying that Christ suffered the proper penalty of the law as the vicarious substitute of his people, and thus took away legally their sins and purchased pardon.

9. Denying that the righteousness, that is, the active obedience of Christ to the law, is imputed to his people for their justification, so that they are righteous in the eye of the law, and therefore justified.

10. Teaching, in opposition to the Standards, that justification is simply pardon.”

Dr. Junkins, in a letter to Mr. Barnes informing him that the above charges were about to be preferred, said : “ Most conscientiously do I believe that you have fallen into dangerous error. I feel that your doctrine shakes the foundation of my personal hopes for eternity. If it be true, then I cannot ‘ read my title clear to mansions in the skies.’ ”

Mr. Barnes was tried upon the charges, some of which, it should be said, he strenuously claimed misrepresented his opinions, and was acquitted. His prosecutor appealed to the Synod of Philadelphia, and was sustained, Mr. Barnes being suspended by the Synod from the ministry. Mr. Barnes appealed to the General Assembly. After an exciting discussion, the appeal was sustained by a vote of one hundred and thirty-four to ninety-six. The decision of the Synod was then reversed by a vote of one hundred and forty-five to seventy-eight.

Dr. Junkins's religious hope endured the strain put upon it by Mr. Barnes's doctrine, and he has long enjoyed the heavenly mansion, the title-deeds of which he so carefully guarded. And there are probably few Presbyterians to whom the attempt to depose such a man as Albert Barnes from the ministry, for holding the views attributed to him, does

not seem absurd. Will there be more who, fifty years hence, will approve the attempt to remove Charles A. Briggs from the Presbyterian ministry for believing that the Scriptures contain historical errors, that men may find God through the church and the reason, and that the righteous are not miraculously made perfect at death?

Since the above was written, a rumor has come to us that after the presentation of Professor Briggs's reply to the charges of the prosecuting committee, a motion will be made to abandon the trial. Should this motion be made and passed, Dr. Briggs would, of course, be triumphantly acquitted, the charges being declared groundless. So the Presbytery of New York would promptly illustrate the service it rendered the accused in voting down the resolution to suspend proceedings, in consideration of his "answers to categorical questions," and putting him on trial for the sentiments expressed in the "Inaugural."

THE LIMITS OF LIBERTY: A BISHOP'S CHARGE TO HIS CLERGY.

THE conflict of theological and ecclesiastical opinion is sharper for the moment in the Presbyterian and Episcopal denominations than in the Congregational body. In other forms the same issue is joined as that which so lately disturbed the Foreign Missionary Society and one of the theological seminaries of the Congregationalists. It is an issue concerning the breadth of liberty to which preachers and teachers are entitled. In the case of the Congregationalists, the beliefs in question pertained to eschatology. With the Presbyterians, they pertain chiefly to the authority and inspiration of the Bible. With the Episcopalians, they pertain partly to doctrine, including the doctrine of inspiration, and also to polity, especially as regards the Episcopate. The real issue, however, in all these bodies, is one and the same. It is not a struggle for victory, nor merely for defense, but a struggle for liberty. The right to hold or to reject certain opinions, without loss of fellowship, is demanded. Inquiry and debate are urgent as to the lines within which all may stand. The roominess of the denomination is in question rather than the relative strength or orthodoxy or churchmanship of any party. The process, involving more or less that is acrimonious and belligerent, is really a sifting of traditional Christianity to distinguish the essentials on which all must agree from that which is secondary or temporary. The debate, in a word, is on the question, What is Christianity? In another editorial we note the progress of the struggle among the Presbyterians as it is brought conspicuously before the public in the proceedings in the case of Professor Briggs. In this article we call attention to the charge of Bishop Potter at the recent convention of the Diocese of New York, in which he treats at length and clearly the questions on which parties are somewhat divided in the Episcopal Church. The positions he takes are of great importance at the present juncture, as he is bishop of the largest

diocese in the country, and both officially and personally is widely influential. The majority of the House of Bishops will not be likely to take different positions.

The principal topics are the authority of the Bible and the grounds of the Episcopate. Incidentally, certain other matters are considered, which we notice in passing. The bishop reminds those who clamor for ecclesiastical trial and censure in the case of brethren whose opinions or practices are disapproved, that it is of little consequence whether the ecclesiastical machinery is set in motion or not, for, he says:—

“When a diocesan court has done its utmost to punish an offender, it is only a diocesan court after all. What is heterodoxy to-day in one jurisdiction may be pronounced by some other court in another to be orthodoxy to-morrow; and until the church provides some ultimate court of appeal in matters of faith and order, diocesan decisions upon either point will absolutely determine nothing.”

It may be surprising to some who have supposed that the Episcopal Church has a very definite authority over its clergy, and a system of regulations which controls the whole body, to find that the dioceses are so independent of each other in respect to doctrines and practices. The Episcopal Church is not nearly so well provided as the Presbyterian in one respect, namely, the search for heresy. The scattered dioceses are decidedly inferior for that purpose to the ascending grades of presbytery, synod, and general assembly.

The bishop makes an observation which disturbs the common impression that there is a decorum, a respect, a dignity of demeanor, cultivated by the Episcopal clergy which has become with all of them a second nature. When speaking of the right of remonstrance, which had been exercised recently, he took occasion to employ a tone of paternal reproof:—

“Falsied be the hand that would seek to rob even the feeblest of us of it! But when it is invoked, it would be well, as I think you will agree with me, that it should be so employed as at least to seem to recognize the simplest laws of courtesy. . . . I am not, I think it will be owned, a stickler for official prerogatives, and I fancy there are very few persons in the Episcopal office who are accustomed to treat such questions with more profound indifference,—an indifference which I have lately had occasion to apprehend has led some persons to suppose that they need not consider the ordinary and reasonable civilities of either personal or official intercourse. It is the first time, I apprehend, in the history of the church, that a bishop has come to know of the contents of a communication addressed exclusively to himself by finding it in the columns of a newspaper; and it will be the only time, I hope, in the history of the church, that a bishop's only information of such a communication shall be of so irresponsible a nature. Indeed, I cannot suppose that any clergyman, or any body of clergymen, could otherwise than very hastily imagine that a bishop could consent to take notice of a document authenticated to him not only by no responsible signature, but by no signature whatever.

'I find it sometimes easier,' said a great French archbishop, 'to make my clergy proficient in theology than in filial and fraternal courtesy.' I am glad to believe, dear brethren, that in these latter graces no one of us would willingly be deficient."

We cannot refrain from noticing also, in passing, a very neat turn the bishop made upon those who had objected to the participation in public services of certain persons not belonging to the Episcopal Church, the reference probably being to Dr. Lyman Abbott and others who spoke in Dr. Rainsford's church last spring. The bishop reminds his hearers that there is as much reason for excluding Greeks, Armenians, and Old Catholics, and that if the law should be invoked in one direction it must be in the other. The priests of the Greek and Russian churches have not been ordained according to the Canons of the Episcopal Church, yet some of them have not only preached, but also performed acts of sacerdotal function, and used other prayers than those prescribed by the Book of Common Prayer:—

"I do not see how, under a rigid rule of construction, the conclusion can be avoided that these most charitable invitations were in direct contravention of the plain prohibitions of Canon 14 of Title I., and also of Section 1 of Canon 22 of the same title. And it must be obvious, if the penal machinery of the church is to be set in operation for the punishment of one class of offenses under the canons above referred to, it cannot stop this side of its application to another and (in one aspect of them) more flagrant set of offenses under the same canons, simply because they who have invoked the canon do not wish it to punish offenders with whom they themselves happen to be in sympathy."

But we must pass on to that which is of chief importance in the charge. The inspiration and authority of the Bible are treated in a catholic spirit, and room is made for the freest investigations of an honest and reverent criticism. It is pointed out that no doctrine concerning inspiration has ever been laid down by the church. The church has never taken the position that the Bible contains no human element, nor that it contains no divine element. The Bible contains both elements, and any bishop, priest, or deacon has the right to inquire how the two elements may be distinguished, and to avail himself of every adequate aid in the conduct of such an inquiry. It is shown that such discriminations have been made from the first; that Clement and Anselm treated the seven days of creation as an allegory and not history; that Irenæus thought the Temptation should not be taken historically; that Gregory, Chrysostom, and others dealt freely with the precepts of the Old Testament; that the patristic theory of inspiration made it illumination rather than miraculous communication which rendered the writer independent of historical tradition; that the church repudiated the Montanist conception of inspiration according to which the inspired man speaks as the passive instrument of the Spirit; and that metaphors which describe the Holy Spirit as acting upon a man "like a flute-player breathing into his

flute, or a plectrum striking a lyre," have always had a suspicion attaching to their use of heresy. The central truths of the Bible the church has always taught with authority: namely, the Fatherhood of God, the person and work of Jesus Christ, the redemption of all mankind, the origin and purpose of human life. But there are other truths which are deductions from the central truths, and in respect to which the church gives a remarkable freedom to individual opinion, — such truths as the mode of the relation of the divine and human nature in Christ, or freewill, or predestination, or the method of the Atonement, or the nature of the inspiration of Holy Scripture. Bishop Potter quotes at length, and with approval, from the authors of "*Lux Mundi*," of whom he speaks as "the small but courageous and reverent group of men." He not merely contends for the right of such men to pursue their investigations, but emphasizes the great service they are rendering: —

"Nay more, it needs I think with much plainness to be said that those who are striving, with a loyalty to Catholic tradition and with a tenderness and reverence for Holy Scripture which is only greater than their tenderness and consideration for their fellow-believers, to find a basis of reconciliation between historic criticism and the inherited faith of the church, are doing a work for which they greatly deserve to be had in lasting and grateful remembrance. The want of our time, we are told, is for something which, amid the vagueness, the uncertainty, the contradictoriness of the thousand voices which assail us, shall speak with definiteness. Yes, it is, but it is no less, nay, even more, I think, something which shall speak with discrimination."

This is a noble vindication of the Christian scholar and of his liberty within the church. The same note will soon be sounded in all the denominations, although in the very same month in the very same city the leading scholar of another religious body was brought to trial on the charge of having denied the verbal inspiration and literal accuracy of every part of the Bible. But the scholars will not be driven out. Their opinions may or may not be accepted, but their liberty will be secured and their service valued. And when historical criticism is generally welcomed, the incubus of untenable theories of inspiration will no longer be resting on the church as a burden too heavy to be borne.

The most important part of the charge, to the members of the Episcopal communion, is that which pertains to the Episcopate itself. Bishop Potter contends for the right of any one to deny direct apostolic succession, and yet to hold any office in the church. For his own part, he believes that the Episcopate was established by the apostles; that the threefold order of the ministry is divinely sanctioned. He thinks it is to be regretted that any man called to the high and sacred office of bishop does not see its sanctions and trace its authority along these lines. Nevertheless, another theory has been held by some of the most venerated bishops of the American and Anglican churches, and liberty to hold it cannot be denied. It is the theory of Lightfoot, Hatch, and others, that

the Episcopate developed by the force of circumstances, and was not a matter of specific divine purpose and institution; that it is necessary to the completeness, but not to the existence, of the church; to its well-being, but not absolutely to its being, and therefore that churches having only the twofold order of presbyters and deacons are real and true churches of Christ.¹ In this connection, Bishop Potter expresses emphatic disapproval of the methods employed to defeat the election of Phillips Brooks as bishop:—

“The effort which we have lately seen in this church to defeat the confirmation of an eminent presbyter elected to the Episcopate, and to defeat it by methods which, in the judgment of all decent people, ought to redound to the lasting dishonor of those who employ them, was an effort ostensibly to compass that defeat on grounds of theological unsoundness, but really, so far as it had any respectable championship, because the individual concerned did not happen to hold a prevalent view of the apostolic succession.”

Such utterances will go far to bring the parties within the Episcopal Church to a mutual recognition of liberty of opinion in matters ecclesiastical, and possibly to abate somewhat the arrogance of pretension which sometimes accompanies belief in the apostolic succession.

Those, in any religious communion, who stand on the platform of a broad liberty in matters of opinion and historical criticism, will agree heartily with Bishop Potter in what he says of the advantage which comes from making room for difference of opinion in the church:—

“It is a very natural instinct of human nature, and it has been, alas! a very preëminent distinction of people who have supremely arrogated to themselves the title of theologians, to crush out opinions that, upon whatever question, do not happen to accord with their own. But it is an instinct as ignoble as it is common, and, more than that, it is one the triumph of which would be scarcely less fatal to the true life and growth of the church than the widest prevalence of error. In a body which, while, as we rejoice to believe, under divine guidance and inspiration, is still made up of very frail and faulty members, led by very fallible and often very imperfectly formed guides, no graver or more perilous situation could come to pass than that in which the due proportion of the faith and the due balance of opposite aspects of the one truth were no longer maintained by the differing and sometimes apparently dissonant voices of its teachers. The moment that we have affirmed the one truth, we are bound to affirm that there are, and rightly ought to be, various standpoints from which to look at it. There are those to whom, constitutionally, such a statement is intolerable; but that does not alter the fact. And, because it is the fact, the church's duty in our time is clear. We want defenders of the

¹ An interesting illustration of this perfectly legitimate mode of reasoning is found in the apology of Pamphilus for Origen, who had declared that the stars are animate and rational beings. Pamphilus argues that since some have held the luminaries of heaven to be animate and rational creatures, while others regard them as spiritless bodies, no one may call another a heretic for holding either view, for there is no open tradition on the subject, and even ecclesiastics have thought diversely of it. This citation from the Fathers might have been added to those introduced into the bishop's charge.

church's liberty, as well as of the church's orthodoxy. . . . There is a divine doctrine, but let us take care that in defining it we do not make it narrower than Christ himself has made it."

PRESIDENT PATTON'S RECOVERED ADDRESS ON FUTURE PROBATION—WITH BRIEF ANNOTATIONS.

THE following address appears to have been originally delivered in March, 1887, while President Patton was a Professor in Princeton Theological Seminary, upon request of the members of the religious society of Princeton College, and is now resuscitated and reproduced by the New York "Evangelist" from the notes of two reporters who were present at the meeting. We are not disposed to take account of the motive of the "Evangelist" in introducing this address as a make-weight in the controversy now raging around Professor Briggs. The efforts of our genial contemporary in times past to look down upon the heresy of a Christian probation have given us no little amusement. And we have not been surprised to find that, under the pressure of recent events, the utterances of our contemporary should have reached the yet loftier tone of thankfulness that whatever heresies it may now be called upon to support, it cannot be charged with having fallen to the level of that theological publican. Still we have no quarrel with our friend, the editor of the "Evangelist," for these past aberrations, or for his tactics in the present controversy, so long as he maintains the good fight which he is now carrying on in behalf of theological freedom and progress.

We reprint the address quite apart from the polemical uses to which it is now being put. Indeed, we wish that it had been printed when delivered, rather than now brought to the public notice, chiefly for its incidental reference to the theory of progressive sanctification after death. It would then have taken its place at once in the discussion of the question of human destiny. It will take its place now after a little, for the discussion is by no means ended. The address throws a clear side light upon the theological and practical bearings of the theory of a Christian probation. It is a candid statement of what, in the opinion of the speaker, is and is not involved in the "Andover Theory," and also it is an equally candid statement of the alternative which, in the opinion of the speaker, must be held in its place. It is for this reason that we reprint the address, and follow it with brief annotations.

It is hardly necessary to call the attention of our readers to the fact that it is, as President Patton characterizes it, "an imperfect stenographic report of an extemporaneous talk." We do not understand, however, that the substantial correctness of the report is called in question. The only correction which President Patton makes, according to the report of an interview, is as follows: "There is only one sentence that can be construed as implying belief in incomplete sanctification at

death, but any intelligent reader will see that I am describing the doctrine of purgatory, and not expressing my own views. A simple change of a period to a colon is sufficient to make this clear." We will indicate the desired change in punctuation in the reprint of the address.

I was told that if I should speak on the subject of Future Probation, I would perhaps do good to some who are reasoning the question in the light of offering themselves to Foreign Missions. The question, as I understand it, is the question of the Andover controversy. Our own faith is sometimes established by means of such controversies. The fact that the matter is now before the public is a good thing. It is only due to ourselves and the men interested, that we should understand and appreciate what Andover believes, and not recklessly accuse her of holding what she does not hold. We should form our judgments on an understanding of *the exact limitations of the views entertained*. It is not a doctrine of Purgatory — we understand that. [The period which follows "We understand that" is to be changed to a colon.] We continually see men going into the other world imperfect; they must be imperfect when they reach there, and need some time for restoration or change. They don't hold to the doctrine of Restoration, nor to this hope for all, "when every winter shall change to spring." They deny that they have any sympathy with this doctrine. It is not a doctrine identical with belief in the "eternal hope;" they don't believe that there will be chances indefinitely prolonged in the future; they deny it. The Judgment at least constitutes a crisis in the lives of all souls. Again, they don't believe in future probation for *all men*. Those who hear the gospel in this world will not have a chance there; those who do not hear it now, or have had no opportunity here, will have some chance in the future. No man will be rejected at the Judgment who has not had this opportunity; that is their statement. Several things are to be asked:

First, Is it true? There are also questions subsidiary which may be asked:—

- (a) Whether this doctrine as held compromises other doctrines?
- (b) Whether, in holding it, a man by logical consequence puts in jeopardy any other doctrine?

Perhaps I am wrong, but I am pretty sure that there is no doctrine that is put in jeopardy by the simple affirmation of this belief; neither the doctrine of sanctification, justification, final and irrevocable retribution, etc. This is not necessarily evidence in its favor, but to abate the violence of the doctrine. [?]

Some doctrines are bad simply because of their correlations, by virtue of the fact that they affect other doctrines. Even if a man held this, he might still hold those other articles of belief.

Second, Whether, in view of this doctrine, it will be prejudicial to the interests of foreign missions?

This is a very important question, and this has been raised into prominence in the controversy. There is a division into two distinct ideas to be made:—

- 1. How this doctrine would affect the individual going as a missionary.
- 2. How it would affect the zeal of the community, upon whom the missionary relies for support. There are two distinct questions to be asked:—

(a) Suppose an individual to offer himself as a missionary, would the simple fact that he held to a personal hope of a future probation for the heathen in any way mar his influence or usefulness, and prejudice him in the perform-

ance of his duties? Subject to correction, it seems to me that a man might go into the field entertaining this view, and yet preach Jesus Christ just as earnestly, with all his might, and during all his life, to the heathen, as though he held the church view. Suppose he held that the heathen have another opportunity to hear of Christ: suppose he was to go and preach to them this Jesus, he would preach the same gospel then as now; there would be no change as to what he would preach, but as to motive: if he fails, he will preach to them in the future life. That is untrue; when I preach to them they cease to be heathen, and they are out of this controversy altogether. There is no more comfort to be taken, or excuse to be pleaded, or lack of zeal for preaching abroad, than for preaching here in New Jersey.

The question does not affect the Princeton people, nor does it affect the people living in Calcutta who have heard the gospel; they cease to come under this category; the only possible effect would be that they might say to them: "You have heard of Christ, and if you reject Him you are a great deal worse than your fathers and grandfathers and great-grandfathers before you. But there is no hope that you may get another chance in the next world." It would not affect his zeal, but it might put him in a position of conciliation to those people to whom he is preaching; it does not paralyze his missionary zeal abroad.

(b) What would be the influence of this doctrine at home? I am very careful how I listen to this class of remarks; there are persons who believe in the premillennial appearing of our Lord in person upon the earth. I am not so foolish as to be one of them. But that does not cut off the nose of Foreign Missions, for many grand and good missionaries have been premillennialists. It may, however, change their character. You must go round the world and sound the trumpet call of the gospel, but this does not prevent but rather stimulates the preaching to the heathen.

People say that the motive to missionary effort is the command of Christ, the present guilt of sin, the sense of neighborhood and fraternity, and love for Christ; yet I believe, if the Christian church should come practically to a belief that the heathen world will have an opportunity of hearing the gospel in a more economical way (hear it by preachers who do not need large salaries, our expensive Board of Foreign Missions located at 23 Centre Street, New York, and a great evangelistic system with immense cost, and a foreign debt of \$100,000), — when the church gets hold of the idea that we can evangelize heathen *when they are dead*, you might preach to them until the crack of doom, and you would not send out many more missionaries into the field.

The fundamental question is: Is this doctrine true? Those who advocate it do so on two grounds. The first is one of mere inference, it is *à priori*. The second is Scriptural, and is based on two or three passages of Scripture which are exceedingly doubtful and cannot sustain their position.

The first passage is about the sin against the Holy Ghost, which shall not be forgiven, "neither in this world nor in that which is to come." Note their argument: One sin you cannot get forgiven in the next world, then there are some sins which you *can* get forgiven in the next world. "The mind plays around loosely," as Matthew Arnold would say, on this passage, and enlarges on it, as a literary man would be wont to do; but it is only a strong emphasis.

The next passage, found in 1 Peter iii. 19, is, "By which he went and

preached unto the spirits in prison." It is a very doubtful passage, doubtful whether it is intended to mean that He went where his Spirit was severed from his body at his crucifixion : your Greek men can tell you.

They say that if you interpret this according to the requirements of the Greek grammar and lexicon, that is all it does mean. But observe, suppose He did go, it does not prove that you and I are going to do it ; there may not now be spirits in prison as at that time. This is their Scriptural basis.

But we cannot build a great doctrine on two passages of such doubtful import. The *à priori* grounds are what they really build upon ; they cite these passages, but their reasoning is *à priori* ; it is like the doctrine of purgatory, which has its foundation in tradition. Their purgatory is first made, and then these passages are adduced to sustain it. They get their doctrine first, and then hunt out texts to prove it. Their whole doctrine is : Jesus Christ died for the world ; no one can be saved unless he believes on Him ; therefore, since this is true, all the world must have a chance to believe. But infants die without consent [?], and so do the heathen ; therefore, etc. That is their whole argument. There are two or three things to be said. What right have they to say that no man can be saved without belief in Christ ? People piously believe that infants can be saved, although they do not have a chance to believe in Christ ; so, many hope that Socrates and Plato will be saved.

But there is nothing in Scripture to warrant that I must go and preach to Plato, that he may be saved. Suppose we grant their premise, we piously hope that infants and some heathen will be saved by the Spirit of God, working when and where He will, without the need of an objective presentation of the gospel. What right have they to say that all the heathen will have an opportunity of believing in Jesus Christ ? Simply this, the sentiment and conscience of some people revolt against the idea of the everlasting destruction of the heathen ; they don't want to believe it. Neither do I. But it is not a question of what we want, but a question as to whether it is true ; whether the Scriptures, on the whole, show that the heathen have some opportunity of believing in Christ. The Scripture is pretty clear on this point. Paul, in his Epistle to the Romans, puts it plainly that they are condemned because they have sinned. They perished without law, not having any law. It is clear from the general trend that the gospel was preached to the world because it was in peril. They would not have been in peril, if it was only a question of postponement.

This life, it is implied, is a season of great crisis, and death fixes our destiny forever. The Andover view, besides laboring under the difficulty of being purely inferential, being based on two passages of Scripture of doubtful import, is (a) opposed to the general trend of the apostolic preaching, and to the direct teaching of the New Testament in making the death of Christ absolutely necessary to man's salvation ; and (b) they have a law in their own nature, and therefore are without excuse.

Again, it is an extra-Biblical doctrine. They don't pretend to get it out of the Bible. Then it cannot bind our conscience, and if extra-Biblical you see where it will finally land you. You can introduce one new doctrine, why not two ? Some people hold that this life is projected forward into the future world. Why not as rational, then, to believe in Purgatory as in this doctrine ? for both are based on the same grounds ; both are the fruit of inferences. Its tendency is back to the old doctrine of the Church of Rome, which

allows [us to believe] what we think to be true, and then justify it on the basis of Scripture, which we hunt up afterwards. It is hazardous, therefore, to believe in it. The Bible is our one rule of faith and practice. I understand that there are some of you who are contemplating the missionary work. Don't let this doctrine interfere with your zeal, or slacken your anxiety with reference to the fate of the heathen. I remember a sermon by Dr. Shedd, of Union Theological Seminary, in which he said that the real basis of Foreign Missions is our belief in their eternal destruction. Let us not permit sentiment to paralyze our hearts; and if there are those here who have made a personal profession of their faith in Jesus Christ, let them be careful how they allow this hope with reference to the heathen to encroach upon their own life, and become a hope with reference to themselves, so that, if we slight opportunities here, it may be compensated for hereafter. Even these men at Andover, who hold to future probation for the heathen, do not believe this. The safe position, justified by the church, is the old position that men are perishing for lack of knowledge, and that men cannot be saved unless they believe on Jesus Christ, and "how shall they believe in Him, of whom they have not heard, and how shall they hear without a preacher? and how shall they preach except they be sent? as it is written, How beautiful are the feet of them that preach the gospel of peace, and bring glad tidings of good things."

We cannot expect to see them in the future life except they hear the gospel and believe. Our own Confession of Faith, which some think very strait-laced, does not hold out that hope, although it does say that "the heathen cannot be saved by framing their lives according to the light of nature."

(1.) "I was told that if I should speak on the subject of Future Probation, I would perhaps do good to some who are reasoning the question in the light of offering themselves to Foreign Missions. The question, as I understand it, is the question of the Andover controversy."

It is not to be wondered at that the minds of those who were "offering themselves to Foreign Missions" should have been exercised about the methods of God's dealing with the heathen. Whether they have any probation or not, and if they have, what it is, is no more an Andover than a Princeton question. It goes wherever men are brought, especially through their consecrations, face to face with the realities of human destiny, and allow themselves to think.

(2.) "It is only due to ourselves and the men interested, that we should understand and appreciate what Andover believes, and not recklessly accuse her of holding what she does not hold. We should form our judgments on an understanding of the exact limitations of the views entertained."

If our theological opponents within our own ranks could have been persuaded to take this position, the "controversy" would have been much simplified in the interest of truth, and would also have been relieved of much personal bitterness. Doubtless the tenacity with which the opposite course was adhered to contributed not a little to the gradual change in public religious sentiment, and in bringing about a final verdict favorable to Andover, but the principle here laid down is the only principle according to which theological controversies can be fairly carried on.

(3.) "Whether this doctrine as held compromises other doctrines? Perhaps I am wrong, but I am pretty sure that there is no doctrine that is put in jeopardy by the simple affirmation of this belief; neither the doctrine of sanctification, justification, final and irrevocable retribution, etc."

It has always been the contention of those who have held the theory of a Christian probation, that it strengthened and intensified all the doctrines of grace. It has been insisted that Christianity suffered continual harm by the method of playing fast and loose with these doctrines, now falling back to the plane of law, and now rising to the plane of grace.

(4.) "Suppose an individual to offer himself as a missionary, would the simple fact that he held to a personal hope of a future probation for the heathen in any way mar his influence or usefulness, and prejudice him in the performance of his duties? Subject to correction, it seems to me that a man might go into the field entertaining this view, and yet preach Jesus Christ just as earnestly, with all his might, and during all his life, to the heathen, as though he held the church view. . . . It would not affect his zeal, but it might put him in a position of conciliation to those people to whom he is preaching; it does not paralyze his missionary zeal abroad."

We emphasize the conciliatory attitude of the missionary to heathen peoples in respect to their ancestors which is here suggested. Nothing seems more terrible to us than the absolute thoughtlessness and insensibility of the majority of Christian people to the relation of the countless dead to Christianity. What are we in this moment of time, or within the Christian generations, to the human race which lies buried under the drift of the ages! The better heathen mind is sensitive to the fate of the dead, not only through natural affection, but through the influence of the family system which is a part of most pagan religions. It was a revelation to us of the intensity of this feeling for the dead, as we listened to the touching words spoken in personal conversation by Dr. Neesima on his last visit to this country, as he referred to the relief which the theory of a Christian probation gave to his own mind concerning the dead of his own race.

(5.) "What would be the influence of this doctrine at home? I am very careful how I listen to this class of remarks," — intimating in what immediately follows that, like the premillennial theory, it would not cut the nerve of missions, but then adding: "People say that the motive to missionary effort is the command of Christ, the present guilt of sin, the sense of neighborhood and fraternity, and love for Christ; yet I believe, if the Christian church should come practically to a belief that the heathen world will have an opportunity of hearing the gospel in a more economical way (hear it by preachers who do not need large salaries, our expensive Board of Foreign Missions located at 23 Centre Street, and a great evangelistic system with immense cost, and a foreign debt of \$100,000), — when the church gets hold of the idea that we can evangelize the heathen *when they are dead*, you might preach to them till the crack of doom, and you would not send out many more missionaries into the field."

How is it that a belief, which does not quench missionary zeal in the field, should render the churches utterly indifferent? What a picture is here drawn of the low state of religious motive in the churches! If the opinion here expressed is true to the fact, shame on the churches, and shame on those who have trained the churches in the motives to missions. It is difficult to read this passage with seriousness, apart from its inconsistency with what has gone before.

(6.) "The fundamental question is: Is this doctrine true? Those who advocate it do so on two grounds. The first is one of mere inference, it is *à priori*. The second is Scriptural, and is based on two or three passages of Scripture which are exceedingly doubtful and cannot sustain their position."

The Scriptural passages which are referred to in the sentences immediately following must mean something. Words spoken by Christ, or of Him, are not so barren of meaning as the slighting interpretation here given them would imply. Neither are they foreign to the spirit or method of Christianity. The presumption from the New Testament is in favor of the interpretation which unbiased commentators have with singular unanimity given them. It is assumed that the burden of proof rests upon the theory of a Christian probation for all men; whereas it is the opposite theory that death precludes the knowledge of Christ, and therefore the Christian motive to salvation, which is alien to the whole current of thought as it comes through the gospel narratives and the life and doctrine of the early church. As we have elsewhere remarked: ¹—

"The burden of proof rests with those who affirm the universal decisiveness of this life, irrespective of the knowledge of Christ and his redemption. For if this be a doctrine of Holy Scripture we must expect it to be clearly, positively, and continuously taught. It is inconceivable that such a doctrine should be left to inference or implication. But upon examination no such proof as ought to be expected appears. Not more than five or six passages have been adduced by the advocates of the dogma, and these have been shown to be irrelevant. Scarcely a passage quoted in favor of the dogma of the universal decisiveness of this life has the support of intelligent Biblical scholarship. On the other hand, we should naturally expect that the theory of the knowledge of Christ hereafter, for those who have not known Him here, would be taught by implication, rather than by direct and constant affirmation, by incidental reference to a fact, as in 1st Peter, rather than through current exhortation. There was no reason why this theory should have been brought to the front. It was not needed in the preaching of the gospel to those who were hearing the gospel, and it had not been denied. There was no heresy of a limited Christianity to combat, and therefore it had not then as now an apologetic value."

Inferential faith, too, has its rights, we are to remember. In some respects it is stronger than faith based on proof texts, for these are subject to "doubtful" interpretations. Inferential faith gives us the dogma of the salvation of infants. There is not a single plain word of Scrip-

¹ *Andover Review*, March, 1888, p. 305.

ture for it. We believe it simply because it is impossible to believe the contrary dogma of the damnation of infants and retain our belief in the revealed character of God. By what right of logic does one limit the reach of inferential faith, and exclude the heathen from the possibility of the gracious mercy of God?

(7.) "What right have they to say that no man can be saved without belief in Christ? People piously believe that infants can be saved, although they do not have a chance to believe in Christ; so many hope that Socrates and Plato will be saved. . . . Suppose we grant their premise, we piously hope that infants and some heathen will be saved by the Spirit of God, working when and where He will, without the need of an objective presentation of the gospel."

What is the common ground of salvation on which infants and Socrates and Plato are saved? If there is no common ground, how far does the principle on which infants are saved work up into the race, and how far does the principle on which Socrates and Plato are saved work down into the race? And if either or both principles produce any appreciable effect, why say, in conclusion, that "we cannot expect to see them (the heathen) in the future life except they hear the gospel and believe"? Why fall back upon "the safe position, justified by the church, that men are perishing for lack of knowledge, and that men cannot be saved unless they believe on Jesus Christ"? The simple explanation of this inconsistency is, that the church has come to believe so profoundly in the necessity and power of *motives* drawn from the life and passion of Christ, and to base its hopes for the salvation of the race so completely upon the presentation of Christ, that one unconsciously comes round to the practical exhortation with which President Patton concludes, even though it be at the expense of logic. When, as in the present case, one flings out the challenge: "What right have they to say that no man can be saved without belief in Christ"? and then goes on to argue for a salvation "without the need of an objective presentation of the gospel," we are always prepared to find such an one concluding by shutting up the heathen to faith, and then arguing for missions — "How shall they believe in Him of whom they have not heard?"

Let it be said, however, once for all, that the question of the possibility or impossibility of the salvation of *any* apart from the knowledge of and belief in Christ is a very unimportant question in its practical bearings. The real question is, Will men be saved, are they being saved — the many, not the few — without the presentation of the motives of the gospel?

But, to return to the argument of President Patton, what is the ground on which he rejects the hope of the presentation of the gospel to all men? What is the alternative which he proposes?

(8.) "What right have they to say that all the heathen will have an opportunity of believing in Jesus Christ? Simply this, the sentiment and conscience

of some people revolt against the idea of the everlasting destruction of the heathen ; they don't want to believe it. Neither do I. But it is not a question of what we want, but a question as to whether it is true ; whether the Scriptures, on the whole, show that the heathen have some opportunity of believing in Christ."

Yes, that is the question, What, on the whole, is the outcome of Scripture in regard to the reach of Christianity? The growing consciousness of the church against the dogma of the universal damnation of the heathen is to be respected. Unless we believe that the Spirit no longer guides the church into the truth, we must give due weight to the Christian sentiment of the nineteenth century. Still we agree with President Patton in accepting the teachings of the Bible as a whole as decisive. And, as we have already said, we believe that the Christianity of the Bible points to a Christian opportunity for the race. Christianity lifts the race to the plane of grace.

The alternative to this conception is clearly intimated in the words just quoted, and also in the allusion which follows to the sermon by Dr. Shedd, "in which he said that the real basis of foreign missions is our belief in the eternal destruction" (of the heathen). This view runs back into the awful dilemma in which the Westminster Confession leaves the heathen world: "The heathen cannot be saved by framing their lives according to the light of nature." Neither "can they be saved unless they believe on Jesus Christ." But "how shall they believe in Him of whom they have not heard, and how shall they hear without a preacher, and how shall they preach except they be sent?" The heathen are thus shut up to the mercy of the church rather than to the mercy of God,—a conclusion which affords, as Dr. Shedd has said, a basis for the appeal for foreign missions, but a conclusion which has as yet afforded very little relief to the heathen. Doubtless some who manage and support our missionary organizations still hold to this conclusion. But we judge from the discussions in the American Board that the majority of those who reject the hope of the possibility of the future knowledge of Christ, as a motive to repentance and faith, have come to accept what is known as the essential Christ theory, which though entirely lacking in force and grip of motive, is free from the unwarranted inhumanity of the Westminster conclusion.

We will simply remark, as we turn from this interesting address, that we should suppose that the impression produced by it upon the minds of the Princeton students would have been, that there was no reason in itself why the theory of a Christian probation for the heathen should not be accepted, and that, in view of the alternative proposed, there was every reason why it should be accepted.

THEOLOGICAL AND RELIGIOUS INTELLIGENCE.

THE PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH IN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA AGAINST THE REV. CHARLES A. BRIGGS, D. D.¹

Report of the Committee of Prosecution, with Charges and Specifications submitted to the Presbytery of New York, October 5, 1891, by the Committee of Prosecution.

COMMITTEE OF PROSECUTION. — George W. F. Birch, D. D., Joseph J. Lampe, D. D., Robert F. Sample, D. D., John J. Stevenson, John J. McCook.

NEW YORK, October 5, 1891.

TO THE PRESBYTERY OF NEW YORK :

The Committee of Prosecution in the case of Dr. Briggs, appointed in compliance with Section 11 of the Book of Discipline, at the meeting of Presbytery in May last, report as follows: —

Inasmuch as four of their number were absent in the performance of their duties as commissioners at the session of the General Assembly held at Detroit, and as Dr. Briggs had sailed for Europe, to be absent until autumn, they made a report of progress at the meeting of Presbytery in June, indicating their intention of presenting the charges and specifications at the meeting of Presbytery in October.

The Committee have decided to base charges and specifications upon what is contained in Dr. Briggs' inaugural address alone. Their reasons for adopting this course are as follows: —

I. By direction of the Presbytery, the inaugural address was the original subject of inquiry by the Committee of Presbytery appointed on April 13, 1891, and it was upon the report of that committee that a judicial investigation was instituted.

II. Because of the recent publication of the inaugural address. In this way any objection which might be made, under the limitation of Section 117 of the Book of Discipline, as to the length of time which has elapsed since the publication of earlier works, has been avoided.

III. Because the inaugural address may be regarded as the most deliberate and emphatic expression of Dr. Briggs' doctrine, and therefore representing most fairly his position with respect to those doctrines upon which the charges and specifications are based. Since the inaugural address was first delivered and published, it has been widely criticised, but in spite of these criticisms a second edition has been published, in which all the doctrines set forth in the first edition are presented without modification, being rather reaffirmed and emphasized in a preface and in an appendix.

IV. Because of the vital importance of the doctrines with which the inaugural address deals.

V. Because the address was delivered as an introduction to a course of lectures on Biblical theology, and is therefore to be taken as a formal

¹ The full text of the charges against Dr. Briggs, with the exception of the Scriptural citations (the references only being given), is printed in the *Review* for the benefit of our readers in following the trial before the New York Presbytery, November 4, 1891. Should proceedings be discontinued, it may still be of value for reference. — Ed.

declaration of the Professor's attitude with respect to some of the more important subjects in his new department.

It has been decided by your committee that it is neither necessary nor advisable to embrace in the list of charges all the doctrinal errors contained in the inaugural address, and, while its teachings respecting miracles, the original condition of man, the nature of sin, race redemption, and Dr. Briggs's scheme of Biblical theology in general, are not in harmony with the Scriptures, and are calculated to weaken confidence in the Word of God, and to encourage presumption on the clemency and long-suffering of God, yet in order that we may avoid an undue extension of the trial, and the confusion of thought that might follow an attempt to compass all the errors contained in said address, we have deemed it best to confine attention to a few departures from the teachings of the Scriptures which are fundamental to the entire discussion.

Furthermore, your committee is not unmindful of the fact that the erroneous and ill-advised utterances of Dr. Briggs in the inaugural address have seriously disturbed the peace of the church and led to a situation full of difficulty and complication, and have produced such widespread uneasiness and agitation throughout the church as to cause sixty-three presbyteries to overture the General Assembly with reference to the same; yet for the reasons above given we have determined not to include this grave offense against the peace of the church in the list of formal charges.

The committee present the following charges and specifications, which, in compliance with the provisions of Section 10 of the Book of Discipline, it becomes their duty to prosecute in the name and by the authority of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America.

CHARGES AND SPECIFICATIONS.

CHARGE I.

The Presbyterian Church in the United States of America charges the Reverend Charles A. Briggs, D. D., being a minister of the Presbyterian Church, and a member of the Presbytery of New York, with teaching doctrines which conflict irreconcilably with and are contrary to the cardinal doctrine taught in the Holy Scriptures and contained in the Standards of the Presbyterian Church, that the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments are the only infallible rule of faith and practice.

These hurtful errors, striking at the vitals of religion, and contrary to the regulations and practice of the Presbyterian Church, were promulgated in an inaugural address which Dr. Briggs delivered at the Union Theological Seminary in the city of New York, January 20, 1891, on the occasion of his induction into the Edward Robinson Chair of Biblical Theology, which address has, with Dr. Briggs's approval, been published and extensively circulated, and republished in a second edition with a preface and an appendix.

SPECIFICATION I.

Dr. Briggs declares that "there are historically three great fountains of divine authority, — the Bible, the Church, and the Reason," — thus making the Church and the Reason each to be an independent and sufficient fountain of divine authority.

INAUGURAL ADDRESS.

Page 25 : "The majority of Christians from the apostolic age have found God through the church. Martyrs and saints, fathers and schoolmen, the profoundest intellects, the saintliest lives, have had this experience."

Page 26 : "Nevertheless, the church is a seat of divine authority, and the multitudes of pious souls in the present and the past have not been mistaken in their experience when they have found God in the church."

Page 26 : "Another means used by God to make himself known is the forms of the Reason, using Reason in a broad sense to embrace the metaphysical categories, the conscience and the religious feeling. Here, in the Holy of Holies of human nature, God presents himself to those who seek Him."

Page 28 : "We have examined the Church and the Reason as seats of divine authority in an introduction to our theme, the *Authority of the Scriptures*, because they open our eyes to see mistakes that are common to the three departments. Protestant Christianity builds its faith and life on the divine authority contained in the Scriptures, and too often depreciates the Church and the Reason."

Page 86 : "But preferring to use my limited time in opposing the depreciation of the Church and the Reason, too often characteristic of Protestants; and in an effort briefly to state, as a fact of history, that these are sources of divine authority."

These declarations are contrary to the Scripture: Isa. viii. 20; Ps. cxix. 96; Gal. i. 8, 9; Matt. iv. 4, 7, 10; Matt. v. 19; Matt. vii. 24; Matt. xxii. 29, 31, 36, 40; Mark vii. 7, 13; Acts vii. 38; Acts xvii. 11; 1 Pet. iv. 11; 1 John v. 10; Luke i. 3, 4; 2 Pet. i. 19, 21; Gal. iii. 8 to 16; John v. 39; Deut. iv. 2; Deut. xii. 32; Rev. xxii. 19; Jer. xxiii. 22; Jer. viii. 8, 9; Rom. iii. 2; Acts xviii. 28.

These declarations are contrary to our standards, Confession of Faith: Chap. I., Secs. I., II., VIII., X. : —

I. Although the light of nature, and the works of creation and providence, do so far manifest the goodness, wisdom, and power of God as to leave men inexcusable, yet they are not sufficient to give that knowledge of God, and of his will, which is necessary unto salvation; therefore it pleased the Lord, at sundry times and in divers manners, to reveal himself, and to declare that his will unto his church; and afterwards, for the better preserving and propagating of the truth, and for the more sure establishment and comfort of the church against the corruption of the flesh, and the malice of Satan and of the world, to commit the same wholly unto writing; which maketh the Holy Scripture to be most necessary, those former ways of God's revealing his will unto his people being now ceased.

II. Under the name of Holy Scripture, or the word of God written, are now contained all the books of the Old and New Testament, which are these : —

OF THE OLD TESTAMENT.

Genesis.
Exodus.
Leviticus.
Numbers.
Deuteronomy.

Joshua.
Judges.
Ruth.
I. Samuel.
II. Samuel.

I. Kings.
II. Kings.
I. Chronicles.
II. Chronicles.
Ezra.

Nehemiah.	Jeremiah.	Jonah.
Esther.	Lamentations.	Micah.
Job.	Ezekiel.	Nahum.
Psalms.	Daniel.	Habakkuk.
Proverbs.	Hosea.	Zephaniah.
Ecclesiastes.	Joel.	Haggai.
The Song of Songs.	Amos.	Zechariah.
Isaiah.	Obadiah.	Malachi.

OF THE NEW TESTAMENT.

The Gospels according to	Galatians.	The Epistle to the Hebrews.
Matthew.	Ephesians.	The Epistle of James.
Mark.	Philippians.	The first and second Epistles of Peter.
Luke.	Colossians.	The first, second, and third Epistles of John.
John.	Thessalonians, I.	The Epistle of Jude.
The Acts of the Apostles.	Thessalonians, II.	The Revelation.
Paul's Epistles to the Romans.	To Timothy, I.	
Corinthians, I.	To Timothy, II.	
Corinthians, II.	To Titus.	
	To Philemon.	

All which are given by inspiration of God, to be the rule of faith and life.

VIII. The Old Testament in Hebrew (which was the native language of the people of God of old) and the New Testament in Greek (which at the time of the writing of it was most generally known to the nations), being immediately inspired by God, and by his singular care and providence kept pure in all ages, are therefore authentic; so as in all controversies of religion the church is finally to appeal unto them. But because these original tongues are not known to all the people of God who have right unto and interest in the Scriptures, and are commanded in the fear of God to read and search them, therefore they are to be translated into the vulgar language of every nation unto which they come, that, the word of God dwelling plentifully in all, they may worship Him in an acceptable manner, and through patience and comfort of the Scriptures may have hope.

X. The Supreme Judge, by which all controversies of religion are to be determined, and all decrees of councils, opinions of ancient writers, doctrines of men, and private spirits, are to be examined, and in whose sentence we are to rest, can be no other but the Holy Spirit speaking in the Scripture.

Larger Catechism, 2 and 3:—

Q. 2. *How doth it appear that there is a God?*

A. The very light of nature in man, and the works of God, declare plainly that there is a God; but his word and Spirit only, do sufficiently and effectually reveal Him unto men for their salvation.

Q. 3. *What is the word of God?*

A. The holy Scriptures of the Old and New Testament are the word of God, the only rule of faith and obedience.

Shorter Catechism, 2:—

Q. 2. *What rule hath God given to direct us how we may glorify and enjoy Him?*

A. The word of God, which is contained in the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments, is the only rule to direct us how we may glorify and enjoy Him.

SPECIFICATION II.

Dr. Briggs affirms that, in the case of some, the Holy Scriptures are not sufficient to give that knowledge of God and his will which is necessary unto salvation, even though they strive never so hard; and that such persons, setting aside the supreme authority of the word of God, can obtain that saving knowledge of Him through the church.

INAUGURAL ADDRESS.

Page 25: "But what shall we say of a modern like Newman, who could not reach certainty, striving never so hard, through the Bible or the Reason, but who did find divine authority in the institutions of the church?"

Page 28: "Spurgeon is an example of the average modern Evangelical who holds the Protestant position, and assails the Church and Reason in the interest of the authority of Scripture. But the average opinion of the Christian world would not assign him a higher place in the kingdom of God than Martineau or Newman."

These declarations are contrary to the Scripture: 2 Tim. iii. 15-17; James i. 18; Eph. ii. 20; Ps. cxix. 105, 130; Luke xvi. 31; John xiv. 6; John xx. 31; 2 Tim. i. 9, 10; 2 Thess. ii. 13; 1 Thess. ii. 13; John vi. 45.

These declarations are contrary to our standards: Confession of Faith, Chap. I., Secs. I., V., VI., VII.:—

I. Although the light of nature, and the works of creation and providence, do so far manifest the goodness, wisdom, and power of God as to leave men inexcusable, yet they are not sufficient to give that knowledge of God and of his will which is necessary unto salvation; therefore it pleased the Lord, at sundry times and in divers manners, to reveal himself, and to declare that his will unto his church; and afterwards, for the better preserving and propagating of the truth, and for the more sure establishment and comfort of the church against the corruption of the flesh, and the malice of Satan and of the world, to commit the same wholly unto writing, which maketh the Holy Scripture to be most necessary; those former ways of God's revealing his will unto his people being now ceased.

V. We may be moved and induced by the testimony of the church to an high and reverent esteem for the Holy Scripture; and the heavenliness of the matter, the efficacy of the doctrine, the majesty of the style, the consent of all the parts, the scope of the whole (which is to give all glory to God), the full discovery it makes of the only way of man's salvation, the many other incomparable excellencies and the entire perfection thereof, are arguments whereby it doth abundantly evidence itself to be the word of God; yet, notwithstanding, our full persuasion and assurance of the infallible truth and divine authority thereof is from the inward work of the Holy Spirit, bearing witness by and with the word in our hearts.

VI. The whole counsel of God, concerning all things necessary for his own glory, man's salvation, faith, and life, is either expressly set down in Scripture, or by good and necessary consequence may be deduced from Scripture: unto which nothing at any time is to be added, whether by new revelations of the Spirit, or traditions of men. Nevertheless we acknowledge the inward illumination of the Spirit of God to be neces-

sary for the saving understanding of such things as are revealed in the word; and that there are some circumstances concerning the worship of God, and government of the church, common to human actions and societies, which are to be ordered by the light of nature and Christian prudence, according to the general rules of the word, which are always to be observed.

VII. All things in Scripture are not alike plain in themselves, nor alike clear unto all; yet those things which are necessary to be known, believed, and observed, for salvation, are so clearly propounded and opened in some place of Scripture or other, that not only the learned but the unlearned, in a due use of the ordinary means, may attain unto a sufficient understanding of them.

SPECIFICATION III.

Dr. Briggs affirms that some (such as James Martineau, who denies the doctrines of the Holy Trinity, the Incarnation, the Atonement, the Resurrection of the Body, the personality of the Holy Ghost, who rejects the miracles of the Bible and denies the truth of the Gospel narratives, as well as most of the theology of the Epistles), to whom the Holy Scripture is not sufficient to give that knowledge of God and of his will which is necessary unto salvation, may turn from the supreme authority of the word of God and find that knowledge of Him through the Reason.

INAUGURAL ADDRESS.

Page 27: "Martineau could not find divine authority in the church or the Bible, but he did find God enthroned in his own soul. There are those who would refuse these Rationalists a place in the company of the faithful. But they forget that the essential thing is to find God and divine certainty, and if these men have found God without the mediation of Church and Bible, Church and Bible are means and not ends; they are avenues to God, but are not God. We regret that these Rationalists depreciate the means of grace so essential to most of us, but we are warned lest we commit a similar error and depreciate the Reason and the Christian consciousness."

Page 28: "Spurgeon is an example of the average modern Evangelical, who holds the Protestant position, and assails the Church and Reason in the interest of the authority of Scripture. But the average opinion of the Christian world would not assign him a higher place in the kingdom of God than Martineau or Newman. May we not conclude, on the whole, that these three representative Christians of our time, living in or near the world's metropolis, have, each in his way, found God and rested on his divine authority."

These declarations are contrary to the Scripture: 1 John v. 10; John xiv. 6; Acts iv. 12; Acts viii. 32-35; Acts x. 43; 1 Cor. ii. 13, 14; Eph. ii. 20; Romans xvi. 25, 26; James i. 18; Matt. xxii. 29; 1 Cor. i. 19-21.

These declarations are contrary to our standards; Confession of Faith, Chap. I., Secs. I., V., VI., VII.:—

I. Although the light of nature, and the works of creation and providence, do so far manifest the goodness, wisdom, and power of God as to leave men inexcusable, yet they are not sufficient to give that knowledge of God and of his will which is necessary unto salvation; therefore it pleased the Lord, at sundry times and in divers manners, to reveal

himself, and to declare that his will unto his church; and afterwards, for the better preserving and propagating of the truth, and for the more sure establishment and comfort of the church against the corruption of the flesh, and the malice of Satan and of the world, to commit the same wholly unto writing, which maketh the Holy Scripture to be most necessary; those former ways of God's revealing his will unto his people being now ceased.

V. We may be moved and induced by the testimony of the church to an high and reverent esteem for the Holy Scripture; and the heavenliness of the matter, the efficacy of the doctrine, the majesty of the style, the consent of all the parts, the scope of the whole (which is to give all glory to God), the full discovery it makes of the only way of man's salvation, the many other incomparable excellencies and the entire perfection thereof, are arguments whereby it doth abundantly evidence itself to be the word of God; yet, notwithstanding, our full persuasion and assurance of the infallible truth and divine authority thereof is from the inward work of the Holy Spirit, bearing witness by and with the word in our hearts.

VI. The whole counsel of God, concerning all things necessary for his own glory, man's salvation, faith, and life, is either expressly set down in Scripture, or by good and necessary consequence may be deduced from Scripture: unto which nothing at any time is to be added, whether by new revelations of the Spirit, or traditions of men. Nevertheless we acknowledge the inward illumination of the Spirit of God to be necessary for the saving understanding of such things as are revealed in the word; and that there are some circumstances concerning the worship of God, and government of the church, common to human actions and societies, which are to be ordered by the light of nature and Christian prudence, according to the general rules of the word, which are always to be observed.

VII. All things in Scripture are not alike plain in themselves, nor alike clear unto all; yet those things which are necessary to be known, believed, and observed, for salvation, are so clearly propounded and opened in some place of Scripture or other, that not only the learned but the unlearned, in a due use of the ordinary means, may attain unto a sufficient understanding of them.

SPECIFICATION IV.

Dr. Briggs asserts that the temperaments and environments of men determine which of the three ways of access to God they may pursue.

INAUGURAL ADDRESS.

Page 28: "May we not conclude, on the whole, that these three representative Christians of our time, living in or near the world's metropolis, have, each in his way, found God and rested on divine authority? May we not learn from them not to depreciate any of the means whereby God makes himself known to men? Men are influenced by their temperaments and environments which of the three ways of access to God they may pursue."

This statement is contrary to the Scripture: 1 Pet. i. 23, 25; 1 Gal. i. 8, 9; John xiv. 6.

This statement is contrary to our standards: Confession of Faith, Chap. I., Secs. I., VI.:—

I. Although the light of nature, and the works of creation and providence, do so far manifest the goodness, wisdom, and power of God as to leave men inexcusable, yet they are not sufficient to give that knowledge of God and of his will which is necessary unto salvation; therefore it pleased the Lord, at sundry times and in divers manners, to reveal himself, and to declare that his will unto his church; and afterwards, for the better preserving and propagating of the truth, and for the more sure establishment and comfort of the church against the corruption of the flesh, and the malice of Satan and of the world, to commit the same wholly unto writing, which maketh the Holy Scripture to be most necessary; those former ways of God's revealing his will unto his people being now ceased.

VI. The whole counsel of God, concerning all things necessary for his own glory, man's salvation, faith, and life, is either expressly set down in Scripture, or by good and necessary consequence may be deduced from Scripture: unto which nothing at any time is to be added, whether by new revelations of the Spirit, or traditions of men. Nevertheless we acknowledge the inward illumination of the Spirit of God to be necessary for the saving understanding of such things as are revealed in the word; and that there are some circumstances concerning the worship of God, and government of the church, common to human actions and societies, which are to be ordered by the light of nature and Christian prudence, according to the general rules of the word, which are always to be observed.

SPECIFICATION V.

Dr. Briggs makes statements in regard to the Holy Scriptures which cannot be reconciled with the doctrine of the true and full inspiration of those Scriptures as the "Word of God written."

INAUGURAL ADDRESS.

Page 30: "The Bible, as a book, is paper, print, and binding — nothing more. It is entitled to reverent handling for the sake of its holy contents, because it contains the divine word of redemption for man, and not for any other reason whatever."

Page 31: "There is nothing divine in the text, — in its letters, words, or clauses. There are those who hold that thought and language are as inseparable as body and soul. But language is rather the dress of thought. A master of many languages readily clothes the same thought in half a dozen different languages. The same thought in the Bible itself is dressed in different literary styles, and the thought of the one is as authoritative as the other. The divine authority is not in the style or in the words, but in the concept, and so the divine power of the Bible may be transferred into any human language. The divine authority contained in the Scriptures speaks as powerfully in English as in Greek, in Choctaw as in Aramaic, in Chinese as in Hebrew. We force our way through the language and the letter, the grammar and the style, to the inner substance of the thought, for there, if at all, we shall find God."

Page 34: "It is not a pleasant task to point out errors in the sacred Scriptures. Nevertheless, historical criticism finds them, and we must meet the issue, whether they destroy the authority of the Bible or not."

Pages 35, 36: "I shall venture to affirm that, so far as I can see, there are errors in the Scriptures that no one has been able to explain

away; and the theory that they were not in the original text is sheer assumption, upon which no mind can rest with certainty. If such errors destroy the authority of the Bible, it is already destroyed for historians. Men cannot shut their eyes to truth and fact. But on what authority do these theologians drive men from the Bible by this theory of inerrancy? The Bible itself nowhere makes this claim. The creeds of the church nowhere sanction it. It is a ghost of modern evangelicalism to frighten children. The Bible has maintained its authority with the best scholars of our time, who with open minds have been willing to recognize any error that might be pointed out by historical criticism, for these errors are all in the circumstantial and not in the essentials; they are in the human setting, not in the precious jewel itself; they are found in that section of the Bible that theologians commonly account for from the providential superintendence of the mind of the author, as distinguished from divine revelation itself. It may be that this providential superintendence gives infallible guidance in every particular; and it may be that it differs but little, if at all, from the providential superintendence of the fathers and schoolmen and theologians of the Christian church. It is not important for our purpose that we should decide this question. If we should abandon the whole field of providential superintendence so far as inspiration and divine authority are concerned, and limit divine inspiration and authority to the essential contents of the Bible, to its religion, faith, and morals, we would still have ample room to seek divine authority where alone it is essential, or even important, in the teaching that guides our devotions, our thinking, and our conduct."

Page 95: "I have not taken a brief to prove the errancy of Scripture. Conservative men should hesitate before they force the critics in self-defense to make a catalogue of errors in the Bible. It is not my place to distinguish between the essential and the non-essential contents of the Bible. The errors are in the only texts we have, and every one is forced to recognize them."

These statements are contrary to the Scriptures: Heb. i. 1, 2; Acts i. 16; Acts iii. 18; 1 Cor. ii. 13; 2 Pet. i. 20, 21; 2 Tim. iii. 16; Rom. ix. 17; Mark xii. 36; Acts vii. 38; Acts xxviii. 25; 2 Sam. xxiii. 2; Ps. xix. 7; Ps. cxix. 142, 160; Dan. x. 21; Num. xxiii. 19; Luke i. 1-4; John xvii. 17; Rom. xv. 3, 4; 1 Thess. ii. 13; Matt. vi. 17-19; Heb. xii. 27; Gal. iii. 16; John x. 34-36; Isa. viii. 20; 1 Pet. i. 23, 25; Acts xxiv. 14.

These statements are contrary to our standards: Confession of Faith, Chap. I., Secs. I., II., IV., V., VIII., IX.; Chap. XIV., Sec. II.:—

I. Although the light of nature, and the works of creation and providence, do so far manifest the goodness, wisdom, and power of God as to leave men inexcusable, yet they are not sufficient to give that knowledge of God and of his will which is necessary unto salvation; therefore it pleased the Lord, at sundry times and in divers manners, to reveal himself, and to declare that his will unto his church; and afterwards, for the better preserving and propagating of the truth, and for the more sure establishment and comfort of the church against the corruption of the flesh, and the malice of Satan and of the world, to commit the same wholly unto writing; which maketh the Holy Scripture to be most necessary; those former ways of God's revealing his will unto his people being now ceased.

II. Under the name of Holy Scripture, or the word of God written,

are now contained all the books of the Old and New Testament, which are these : —

Of the Old Testament.

Genesis.	II. Chronicles.	Daniel.
Exodus.	Ezra.	Hosea.
Leviticus.	Nehemiah.	Joel.
Numbers.	Esther.	Amos.
Deuteronomy.	Job.	Obadiah.
Joshua.	Psalms.	Jonah.
Judges.	Proverbs.	Micah.
Ruth.	Ecclesiastes.	Nahum.
I. Samuel.	The Song of Songs.	Habakkuk.
II. Samuel.	Isaiah.	Zephaniah.
I. Kings.	Jeremiah.	Haggai.
II. Kings.	Lamentations.	Zechariah.
I. Chronicles.	Ezekiel.	Malachi.

Of the New Testament.

The Gospels according to Matthew.	Galatians.	The Epistle to the Hebrews.
Mark.	Ephesians.	The Epistle of James.
Luke.	Philippians.	The first and second Epistles of Peter.
John.	Colossians.	The first, second, and third Epistles of John.
The Acts of the Apostles.	Thessalonians I.	The Epistle of Jude.
Paul's Epistle to the Romans.	Thessalonians II.	The Revelation.
Corinthians I.	To Timothy I.	
Corinthians II.	To Timothy II.	
	To Titus.	
	To Philemon.	

All which are given by inspiration of God, to be the rule of faith and life.

IV. The authority of the Holy Scripture, for which it ought to be believed and obeyed, dependeth not upon the testimony of any man or church, but wholly upon God (who is truth itself), the author thereof; and therefore it is to be received, because it is the word of God.

V. We may be moved and induced by the testimony of the church to an high and reverent esteem for the Holy Scripture; and the heavenliness of the matter, the efficacy of the doctrine, the majesty of the style, the consent of all the parts, the scope of the whole (which is to give all glory to God), the full discovery it makes of the only way of man's salvation, the many other incomparable excellencies, and the entire perfection thereof, are arguments whereby it doth abundantly evidence itself to be the word of God; yet, notwithstanding, our full persuasion and assurance of the infallible truth and divine authority thereof is from the inward work of the Holy Spirit, bearing witness by and with the word in our hearts.

VIII. The Old Testament in Hebrew (which was the native language of the people of God of old), and the New Testament in Greek (which at the time of the writing of it was most generally known to the nations), being immediately inspired by God, and by his singular care and providence kept pure in all ages, are therefore authentical; so as in all controversies of religion the church is finally to appeal unto them. But because these original tongues are not known to all the people of God who have right unto and interest in the Scriptures, and are commanded in the fear of God to read and search them, therefore they are to be translated into

the vulgar language of every nation unto which they come, that the word of God dwelling plentifully in all, they may worship Him in an acceptable manner, and through patience and comfort of the Scriptures may have hope.

IX. The infallible rule of interpretation of Scripture is the Scripture itself; and therefore, when there is a question about the true and full sense of any scripture (which is not manifold, but one), it may be searched and known by other places that speak more clearly.

CHAP. XIV. SEC. II. By this faith a Christian believeth to be true whatsoever is revealed in the word, for the authority of God himself speaking therein; and acteth differently upon that which each particular passage thereof containeth; yielding obedience to the commands, trembling at the threatenings, and embracing the promises of God for this life, and that which is to come. But the principal acts of saving faith are, accepting, receiving, and resting upon Christ alone for justification, sanctification, and eternal life, by virtue of the covenant of grace.

SPECIFICATION VI.

Dr. Briggs asserts that Moses is not the author of the Pentateuch, and that Isaiah is not the author of half of the book which bears his name.

INAUGURAL ADDRESS.

Page 33: "It may be regarded as the certain result of the science of the higher criticism that Moses did not write the Pentateuch."

Page 33: "Isaiah did not write half of the book that bears his name."

These statements are contrary to Scripture: Ex. xxiv. 3, 4; Num. xxxiii. 2; Deut. xxxi. 9, 22; Josh. i. 7, 8; Josh. viii. 31; 1 Kings ii. 3; 2 Kings xxi. 8; Ezra iii. 2, 6; Ezra vi. 18; Neh. i. 7, 8; Neh. viii. 1, 14, 15; Neh. x. 29-39; Neh. xiii. 1; 1 Chron. vi. 49; Dan. ix. 11, 13; Matt. xix. 7, 9; Mark vii. 10; Luke xxiv. 27, 44; Luke xx. 28, 37; John i. 45; John v. 45-47; John vii. 19, 23; Romans x. 19; Acts iii. 22; Acts vii. 37, 38; Acts xv. 21; Matt. xii. 17, 18; Luke iii. 4; Luke iv. 17, 18; John xii. 38, 41; Rom. x. 16, 20.

These statements are contrary to our standards: Confession of Faith, Chap. I., Secs. VIII., IX.:—

VIII. The Old Testament in Hebrew (which was the native language of the people of God of old), and the New Testament in Greek (which at the time of the writing of it was most generally known to the nations), being immediately inspired by God, and by his singular care and providence kept pure in all ages, are therefore authentic; and so in all controversies of religion the church is finally to appeal unto them. But because these original tongues are not known to all the people of God who have right unto and interest in the Scriptures, and are commanded in the fear of God to read and search them, therefore they are to be translated into the vulgar language of every nation unto which they come, that, the word of God dwelling plentifully in all, they may worship Him in an acceptable manner, and through patience and comfort of the Scriptures may have hope.

IX. The infallible rule of interpretation of Scripture is the Scripture itself; and therefore, when there is a question about the true and full sense of any scripture (which is not manifold, but one), it may be searched and known by other places that speak more clearly.

SPECIFICATION VII.

Dr. Briggs teaches that predictive prophecy has been reversed by history, and that much of it has not and never can be fulfilled.

INAUGURAL ADDRESS.

Page 38: "Another barrier to the Bible has been the interpretation put upon *Predictive Prophecy*, making it a sort of history before the time, and looking anxiously for the fulfillment of the details of Biblical prediction. Kuenen has shown that if we insist upon the fulfillment of the details of the predictive prophecy of the Old Testament, many of these predictions have been reversed by history; and the great body of the Messianic prediction has not only never been fulfilled, but cannot now be fulfilled, for the reason that its own time has passed forever."

These statements are contrary to the Scriptures: Ps. cv. 8; Matt. ii. 5, 6, 17, 18, 23; Matt. v. 17, 18; Matt. xxi. 4, 5; Matt. xxiv. 15; Dan. xii. 11; Matt. iii. 3; Matt. xxvi. 54, 56; Matt. xxvii. 9, 35; Mark xv. 28; Luke iv. 21; Luke xvi. 17; Luke xviii. 31; Luke xxi. 22; Luke xxiv. 26, 27, 44; John xviii. 32; John xix. 24; John xii. 16; 1 Pet. i. 10, 11; Acts iii. 18; 2 Pet. i. 19.

These statements are contrary to our standards: Confession of Faith, Chap I., Secs. IV., V.:—

IV. The authority of the Holy Scripture, for which it ought to be believed and obeyed, dependeth not upon the testimony of any man or church, but wholly upon God (who is truth itself), the author thereof; and therefore it is to be received, because it is the word of God.

V. We may be moved and induced by the testimony of the church to an high and reverent esteem for the Holy Scripture; and the heavenliness of the matter, the efficacy of the doctrine, the majesty of the style, the consent of all the parts, the scope of the whole (which is to give all glory to God), the full discovery it makes of the only way of man's salvation, the many other incomparable excellencies and the entire perfection thereof, are arguments whereby it doth abundantly evidence itself to be the word of God; yet, notwithstanding, our full persuasion and assurance of the infallible truth and divine authority thereof is from the inward work of the Holy Spirit, bearing witness by and with the word in our hearts.

Shorter Catechism, 4:—

Q. 4. *What is GOD?*

A. God is a Spirit, infinite, eternal, and unchangeable in his being, wisdom, power, holiness, justice, goodness, and truth.

CHARGE II.

The Presbyterian Church in the United States of America charges the Reverend Charles A. Briggs, D. D., being a minister of the Presbyterian Church and a member of the Presbytery of New York, with teaching a doctrine of the character, state, and sanctification of believers after death, which irreconcilably conflicts with and is contrary to the Holy Scriptures and the standards of the Presbyterian Church.

SPECIFICATION.

In the said inaugural address, delivered, published, extensively circulated, and republished as above described, Dr. Briggs teaches as follows:—

INAUGURAL ADDRESS.

Pages 53, 54, 55: "Another fault of Protestant theology is in its limitation of the process of redemption to this world, and its neglect of those vast periods of time which have elapsed for most men in the middle state between death and the resurrection. The Roman Catholic Church is firmer here, though it smears the Biblical doctrine with not a few hurtful errors. The reaction against this limitation, as seen in the theory of second probation, is not surprising. I do not find this doctrine in the Bible, but I do find in the Bible the doctrine of a middle state of conscious higher life in the communion with Christ and the multitude of the departed of all ages; and of the necessity of entire sanctification, in order that the work of redemption may be completed. There is no authority in the Scriptures, or in the creeds of Christendom, for the doctrine of immediate sanctification at death. The only sanctification known to experience, to Christian orthodoxy, and to the Bible is progressive sanctification. Progressive sanctification after death is the doctrine of the Bible and the church; and it is of vast importance in our times that we should understand it, and live in accordance with it. The bugbear of a judgment immediately after death, and the illusion of a magical transformation in the dying hour, should be banished from the world. They are conceits derived from the Ethnic religions, and without basis in the Bible or Christian experience as expressed in the symbols of the church. The former makes death a terror to the best of men, the latter makes human life and experience of no effect; and both cut the nerves of Christian activity and striving after sanctification. Renouncing them as hurtful, unchristian errors, we look with hope and joy for the continuation of the processes of grace and the wonders of redemption in the company of the blessed, to which the faithful are all hastening."

Inaugural Address, Appendix, second edition, pages 107, 108: "Sanctification has two sides, — a negative and a positive, — mortification and vivification; the former is manward, the latter is Godward. Believers who enter the middle state enter guiltless; they are pardoned and justified; they are mantled in the blood and righteousness of Christ; and nothing will be able to separate them from his love. They are also delivered from all temptations such as spring from without, from the world and the devil. They are encircled with influences for good such as they have never enjoyed before. But they are still the same persons, with all the gifts and graces, and also the same habits of mind, disposition, and temper, they had when they left the world. Death destroys the body. It does not change the moral and religious nature of man. It is unpsychological and unethical to suppose that the character of the disembodied spirit will all be changed in the moment of death. It is the Manichean heresy to hold that sin belongs to the physical organization and is laid aside with the body. If this were so, how can any of our race carry their evil natures with them into the middle state and incur the punishment of their sins? The eternal punishment of a man, whose evil nature has been stripped from him by death and left in the grave, is an absurdity. The Plymouth Brethren hold that there are two natures in the redeemed, — the old man and the new. In accordance with such a theory, the old man might be cast off at death. But this is only a more subtle kind of Manicheism, which has ever been regarded as heretical. Sin, as our Saviour teaches, has its source in the heart, — in the higher

and immortal part of man. It is the work of sanctification to overcome sin in the higher nature."

This doctrine is contrary to the Scripture : John i. 29 ; Luke xvi. 22, 26 ; 2 Cor. v. 1-10 ; Matt. xxvi. 41 ; 1 John iii. 2, 9, 10 ; 1 Tim. iv. 7, 8 ; Rev. iii. 4, 5 ; Rev. vii. 9, 13, 14 ; Rev. xiv. 13 ; Rev. xix. 8 ; Heb. xii. 23 ; Eph. v. 26, 27 ; 1 Cor. xv. 51, 52 ; 1 Thess. iv. 16, 17 ; Eph. iii. 15, 16.

This doctrine is contrary to our standards : Confession of Faith, Chap. XXXII., Sec. I. : —

I. The bodies of men after death return to dust, and see corruption ; but their souls (which neither die nor sleep), having an immortal subsistence, immediately return to God who gave them. The souls of the righteous, being then made perfect in holiness, are received into the highest heavens, where they behold the face of God in light and glory, waiting for the full redemption of their bodies : and the souls of the wicked are cast into hell, where they remain in torments and utter darkness, reserved to the judgment of the great day. Besides these two places for souls separated from their bodies, the Scripture acknowledgeth none.

Larger Catechism, 86 : —

Q. 86. What is the communion in glory with Christ, which the members of the invisible church enjoy immediately after death ?

A. The communion in glory with Christ, which the members of the invisible church enjoy immediately after death, is in that their souls are then made perfect in holiness, and received into the highest heavens, where they behold the face of God in light and glory, waiting for the full redemption of their bodies, which even in death continue united to Christ, and rest in their graves as in their beds, till at the last day they be again united to their souls. Whereas the souls of the wicked are at their death cast into hell, where they remain in torments and utter darkness ; and their bodies kept in their graves as in their prisons, until the resurrection and judgment of the great day.

Shorter Catechism, 37 : —

Q. 37. What benefit do believers receive from Christ at their death ?

A. The souls of believers are at their death made perfect in holiness, and do immediately pass into glory ; and their bodies, being still united to Christ, do rest in their graves till the resurrection.

Your Committee recommend that, in compliance with the provisions of section 19 of the Book of Discipline, a copy of the charges and specifications be now served upon Dr. Briggs, and that a citation, signed in the name of the Presbytery by the moderator or clerk, be personally served upon Dr. Briggs, citing him to appear and plead to said charges and specifications at an early day.

All of which is respectfully submitted.

In behalf of the Committee,

G. W. F. BIRCH, *Chairman.*

BOOKS RECEIVED.

Fleming H. Revell Company, New York and Chicago. Three Gates on a Side, and other Sermons. By Charles H. Parkhurst, D. D., Pastor of the Madison Square Church, New York; Author of "The Blind Man's Creed," etc., etc. Pp. 271. \$1.25.

Charles Scribner's Sons, New York. The Poetry of Tennyson. By Henry Van Dyke. Second Edition, revised and enlarged. Pp. xviii, 370. 1891. \$2.00. — Poems of Sidney Lanier. Edited by his Wife. With a Memorial by William Hayes Ward. New Edition. Pp. xli, 260. 1891. \$2.00. — Held Fast for England. A Tale of the Siege of Gibraltar (1779-1783). By G. A. Henty, author of "The Dash for Khartoum," etc., etc. Illustrated by Gordon Browne. Pp. 353. 1891. \$1.50. — The Dash for Khartoum. A Tale of the Nile Expedition. By G. A. Henty, author of "Redskin and Cow-Boy," "By Right of Conquest," etc., etc. With ten page Illustrations, by Joseph Nash, R. I. and John Schoenberg. Pp. 382. 1891. \$1.50. — The Pilots of Pomona. A Story of the Orkney Islands. By Robert Leighton. With eight page Illustrations by John Leighton. Pp. 352. 1891. \$1.50. — Elements of Syriac Grammar, by an Inductive Method. By Robert Dick Wilson, Ph. D., Professor of Old Testament Languages and History in the Western Theological Seminary, Alleghany, Pa. Pp. viii, 209. 1891. — Introductory Syriac Method and Manual. By Robert Dick Wilson, Ph. D. Pp. viii, 160. 1891. — The Life and Times of Nicolò Machiavelli. By Professor Pasquale Villari, author of "The Life and Times of Savonarola," etc. Translated by Madame Linda Villari. A New Edition. (Augmented by the Author, revised by the Translator.) Illustrated. Vol. I., pp. xxxvi, 550. Vol. II., pp. xii, 597. 1891. \$10.00 two vols.

Thomas Whittaker, New York. The Church of England in Nova Scotia and the Tory Clergy of the Revolution. By Arthur Wentworth Eaton, B. A., Presbyter of the Diocese of New York. Pp. xiv, 320. 1891. \$1.50.

The Craig Press, Chicago. Gambling; or, Fortuna, her Temple and Shrine. The True Philosophy and Ethics of Gambling. By James Harold Romain. Pp. 230. 1891. Cloth, \$1.00.

PAMPHLETS. — *Berkeley, California.* A Guide to the Literature of Aesthetics. By Charles Mills Gayley, Professor of the English Language and Literature in the University of California, and Fred Newton Scott, Ph. D., Assistant Professor of English in the University of Michigan. Supplement to the Report of the Secretary of the Board of Regents, University of California. Pp. 116. Sent by Library of University of California on receipt of five cents. 1890. — *Houghton, Mifflin & Co., Boston and New York.* Easter Gleams. By Lucy Larcom. Pp. 45. 1890. 75 cents. — *Congregational Sunday-School and Publishing Society, Boston and Chicago.* Easter Voices. A Carol Service for Easter. By M. C. Hazard. Musical Editor, John W. Tufts. Pp. 16, Supplement 4. 1890. 5 cents, 100 copies, \$1.00. The Easter Service. 1. For the Use of Congregations, Colleges, Schools, and Academies for Public Worship. By the Rev. George H. Hubbard. Pp. 10. 100 copies, \$2.50. — *The Salem Press, Salem.* Ancestry of Calvin Guild, Margaret Taft, James Humphreys, and Rebecca Covell Martin, including over one hundred surnames. 1620-1890. By Howard Redwood Guild, Member of the New England Hist. Gen. Soc., etc., etc. Pp. 42. Copies can be had, postpaid, of H. R. Guild, 147 Benefit Street, Providence, R. I. — *University Press, Cambridge.* Remarks on the New Historical School. By Mellen Chamberlain. Reprinted from the Proceedings of the Massachusetts Historical Society. 1890. — *Philadelphia.* Publications of the University of Pennsylvania. Political Economy and Public Law Series. Edmund J. James, Ph. D., Editor. No. 8. The Federal Constitution of Switzerland. Translated by Edmund J. James, Ph. D., Professor in the University of Pennsylvania. Pp. 46. 1890. 50 cents. For sale by Porter & Coates, Philadelphia. — The Cradle of the

Semites. Two Papers read before the Philadelphia Oriental Club. I. By Daniel G. Brinton, M. D., Professor of American Archæology and Linguistics in the University of Pennsylvania. II. A Reply by Morris Jastrow, Jr., Ph. D., Professor of Arabic and Assistant Librarian in the University of Pennsylvania. Pp. 26. 1890. — *H. F. Brownson, Detroit, Michigan.* The Religion of Ancient Craft Masonry. Pp. 55. 1890. — *Ginn & Company, Boston.* Q. Curti Rufi Historiarum Alexandri Magni Macedonis. Libri III. et IV. The First Two extant Books of Quintus Curtius. For Sight Reading. Edited by Harold N. Fowler. With an Introduction on Reading at Sight, by James B. Greenough. Pp. xiii, 96. 1890. — *Librairie Fischbacher, Paris.* Les Droits et les Torts de la Papauté en les Devoirs des Protestants envers leurs Frères Catholiques Romains. Par E. Petavel-Olliff, Docteur en Théologie. Pp. 74. 1890. — *Patterson & White, Philadelphia.* Luxilla. A Romance. By George E. Miller. Pp. 79. 1890. — *Fleming H. Revell Company, New York and Chicago.* How Josh Worked up a Concept. By Josh, Senior. Pp. 8. 5 cents ; 25 cents per dozen.

